H B Earle

NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment-----Without Compromise.

VOLUME IV.---NO. 44. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 1844. WHOLE NUMBER 200.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At 143, Nassau Street, New-York.

DAVID LEE CHILD, Editor.

☞ All remittances, and letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper, should be addressed to ISAAC T. HOPPER.

TERMS.—$2,00 a year, in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10,00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1,50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post Office Department: "A Postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself."

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Selections.

SPEECH OF MR. HUDSON, ON THE 21st RULE;

Delivered in the House of Representatives, on Thursday, January 18, 1844.

The unfinished business of the morning hour was the report of the select committee on the rules, together with the several pending questions.

Mr. Cobb, who was entitled to the floor from a former day, resumed and concluded his remarks in favor of retaining the rule.

Mr. Hudson followed him, and commenced by observing that he rejoiced that the time had arrived at last, when the subject of this rule, which had excited so much feeling, in the House and out of the House, was now fairly before them for deliberation and discussion. And he rejoiced that those gentlemen who had addressed the House on the subject, had been disposed to exercise that candor and that fairness which should ever characterize a debate in this House; and that in their remarks thus far, nothing had been said which was calculated to produce irritation or unpleasantness of feeling.

Mr. H. was opposed to the recommitment of this report. He was opposed to it because he was opposed to the 21st rule, and because he believed that that rule practically, to all intents and purposes, violated the fundamental principles of the Constitution of the country. Gentlemen who had addressed the House on this subject, had spoken of the right of petition as a right granted by the Constitution. In Mr. H.'s estimation they were not precisely correct in this position. It was a right more sacred; a right which lay deeper than any provision contained in that instrument; a right inherent in free governments, and free institutions. And the right of petition was mentioned in the Constitution, not as granted, but it was there recognized as a right the people already possessed; and there was an express provision therein, that this right should never be infringed.

Mr. H. was not going into any nice metaphysical arguments on the right of petition. Gentlemen who had addressed the House had asked over and over again, what was meant by the right of petition. His answer, in brief, was this: They meant precisely what gentlemen who asked the question meant by it. They meant by the right of petition, with reference to the subject of slavery in this district, precisely what gentlemen meant by petition upon any other subject. Now, what was the common-sense view of this House, and of this country, upon the subject of petition. It consisted in the people's assembling together, if gentlemen pleased, and drawing up a paper setting forth their grievances, and sending that paper to this House, and having it here presented and considered. Let them take a case for illustration. Here was a person who had fought in the battles of the revolution, who petitioned this House for a pension. What, he asked, was the common-sense view which this House, and which the country took of the right of petition in this case? Why, the petition was here brought forward, presented, committed to a committee, and that committee made the requisite examination into the merits of the claim or the case. Now Mr. H. agreed with the gentleman who had just resumed his seat. He was perfectly right upon this subject. The friends of petition in these cases asked of them precisely what they did in every other case; namely, to receive and consider the petition. If the petition was of such a character that it could be considered by being merely read, that was a consideration. If it was of a character that required further investigation, that further investigation should be made. And he would apply this principle to the very gentleman who had addressed the House upon this subject.

The clause of the Constitution in question spoke of the liberty of speech, of the liberty of the press, and of the right of petition, and placed them on precisely the same ground. Now let them take the argument made from the seat near him a few days since, (by Mr. Rhett,) that the right of petition consisted merely in the people's assembling together, signing a paper, putting that paper into the hands of a friend on this floor, and that friend rising in his place, announcing that he had such a petition, giving a brief statement of its contents. Now suppose they applied that principle to the freedom of debate in this House. Suppose his friend near him who had discussed this subject with his usual force and clearness the other day, should rise in this House and say, "Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my views upon this subject, in favor of the 21st rule." Mr. H. would ask that gentleman, if he was present—he asked his friends who took the same ground with him—whether they would consider the freedom of speech abridged if he should be ordered by the Chair to take his seat, and he told that he had briefly stated his object, and that that was the freedom of debate? Every member would regard treatment like this as an insult. But, with precisely the same propriety, might they confine the right of debate upon this floor to briefly stating the object in view, as to limit the freedom of petition to briefly stating the contents according to the rule which operated when they presented petitions. A brief statement of its object, gentlemen told them, was the same in substance as the right of petition. When gentlemen would acquiesce in that principle, with reference to the right of debate, Mr. H. would admit that they could with propriety apply the principle to the right of petition. Why, the gentleman from South Carolina, to whom he had alluded, had come out with an address to the people, in which he had complained that the right of debate was entirely prostrated and annulled in this House by the one-hour rule. He considered an hour a period so short that the freedom of debate was infringed by this rule; and still he told them that the right of petition, which was placed in the Constitution alongside the freedom of debate, consisted merely in stating the object they had in view, and then calmly and quietly submitting to the action of the House?

There was one necessity which Mr. H. might notice, in connection with this subject. One or two gentlemen had told them that the Constitution provided, in the clause to which he had alluded, that no law should be made abridging the freedom of speech, and the right of petition. And then they inquired, briefly, who was the law-making power? and answered, correctly, of course, all the branches of the government. Well, said they, this is no law; the House, having a right to determine its own mode of proceeding, can do that by a rule which the whole government could not do by a law. What was more absurd than this? asked Mr. H. The framers of the Constitution had regarded the right of petition so sacred that they had denied the power of limiting the right to Congress. They had declared, in substance, that though all the branches of the government might concur in a measure for this purpose, they should be prohibited by the law of the land. Now, to suppose that one House, that one branch of the law-making power, could do that by *rule* which the whole government could not do by law, was to Mr. H. perfectly absurd. They might as well say that, although the Constitution denied other powers to Congress—the granting titles of nobility, and the like—still, one branch of the government might come out and do the very thing which the Constitution prohibited Congress itself from doing.

Mr. H. did not believe, with the gentleman from New-York, (Mr. Beardsley,) that the right of petition was secured barely by receiving the petition, and laying it on the table. He believed that there should be consideration, and that the consideration should be commensurate with the importance of the subject.

Mr. Beardsley (Mr. H. yielding for explanation) said he had by no means intended to be understood that simply having the paper handed to the clerk's table, and laid upon the table, was the full enjoyment of the right of petition. But he had meant this, that when a petition was presented, the contents of which they knew, on which they had made up their minds, so that they were prepared to act promptly—when they had adjudged the matter, and fully possessed the views of the petitioners, that then putting it on the table was acting upon the petition, was considering it, (which was the appropriate language applicable to such subjects,) as much as though they had referred it to a committee, and a report was made, and they had spent months in considering that report.

Mr. B. would illustrate this idea by this remark. Thousands of cases arose in the course of judicial proceedings where the question was raised before the court, and judgment was given instanter. Why, the court considered, and considered so far as they understood the proposition, and their minds being made up, they gave judgment at once. They did not keep it under formal advisement, although the record would be that they had considered the subject. This was Mr. B.'s view of the right of petition—that their minds being made up, whenever they felt ready to judge upon the petition, to lay it on the table, was just as much a consideration of it, as to keep it before them for months before they decided upon it.

Mr. Hudson was glad to hear the explanation of the gentleman from New-York. He well knew that there were many petitions excluded by the 21st rule, that were on questions of a very grave and profound character; and that some of these petitions contained able legal arguments, in which the whole subject was spread out in detail; and he apprehended there were questions connected with these subjects, which could not be decided at once, which could not be decided without grave consideration—some of the questions being questions on which the best legal talent in the House, and in the country, perhaps, might be divided. And if petitions of that character were sent in, he contended that the House had no right, and ought not, in cases like this, to make up their judgment at once, without hearing the prayer.

But gentlemen told them that in these cases many of these petitioners asked for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and that Congress had no power to act in this case; that they had no constitutional right to grant the prayer of the petition. He wished to present a few remarks in relation to this subject. He would state first, that the provision of the Constitution which related to this subject, gave Congress absolute jurisdiction; the language of the article was, that Congress should "exercise exclusive legislation," and then that this legislation should not only be exercised, but should extend to "all cases whatsoever." Gentlemen asked whether there were no limitations? Mr. H. admitted that there were limitations—limitations such as they found in the Constitution itself. And one limitation was, that Congress should not impair the right of petition in this district, any more than anywhere else; and another, that they should make no law in relation to the subject of religion, and the like. All these limitations on the power of Congress were general, of course applying to this district, as much as to any other part of the country. So that the declaration that Congress possessed the right to "exclusive legislation," amounted in substance, to the declaration that Congress should possess all legislative powers in this district; that they might do anything in this district that they could constitutionally do elsewhere, and that they were limited only by those general limitations which applied to them with reference to all other subjects, in all other places.

Congress, then, had exclusive jurisdiction. They were to legislate for this district, and they alone; and this legislation was to extend to every subject whatever, which was a proper subject of legislation. Now, gentlemen sometimes told them, that there were certain limitations in the deeds of cession. Mr. H.'s first answer was, that there were no limitations in the deeds of cession which applied to this subject at all; and if there were, that Congress had no right to accept this or any other district, except on the conditions specified in the Constitution itself. The very clause of the Constitution which gave them any right to receive this district, declared expressly, that if they did receive a district for the seat of government, they should have express and full legislative power within its limits.

But was the abolition of slavery, or of the slave-trade, within this district, a proper subject of legislation? Congress possessed all legislative powers, and did the subject of slavery come within that general denomination? Why, if they looked at this or any other country, they would find that there was no nation, and no State in this Union, but had legislated on this very subject. In all the free States, slavery had been abolished; in some of those States, by the constitution of the State—in others, by the laws of the State. Every State in this nation, probably, directly or indirectly, had recognized the subject of slavery, and admitted that it was a subject of legislative action. But they were not confined to the free States. Let them look at the slave States, and they would find, he believed, that they had one and all, by legislation, admitted that this was a proper subject of legislation; and most of them had admitted that Congress possessed full power to legislate on this subject. But a few years since, your State [addressing the Speaker]—the legislature of Virginia—had proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, by which Congress should be prohibited from abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, except by the consent of Maryland and Virginia. Now, here was an express, a double recognition of the subject of slavery, as coming within the legislative power. First, the commonwealth of Virginia admitted that Congress did possess the power to abolish slavery in the District. If it did not, why had it solemnly come forward and asked an amendment of the Constitution to prohibit the exercise of this power? Here was an express recognition of the powers of Congress in this district, and an express recognition that slavery was a legitimate subject of legislation, not only by Congress in this district, but by the different States in this Union. All the laws passed by the slaveholding States, with reference to the condition and situation of their slaves, went upon the ground that this was a proper subject of legislation, and he believed that Mississippi and Alabama, and some others of the States, had provisions in their constitutions that their legislatures should not abolish slavery, thereby admitting that slavery was a legitimate subject of legislation, and that every State had the power to abolish it within her own limits.

And this position, until quite recently, had not been denied. Mr. H. found, by looking into a document which he held in his hand, that gentlemen from all parts of the Union had admitted this. In fact, in the debates which preceded the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, it had been fully and fairly admitted that the clause of the Constitution gave Congress the entire power over the subject, within the limits of its jurisdiction. And in Virginia, before the adoption of the Constitution, the question had been agitated, and the Constitution had been objected to, on the one hand, because it gave to Congress the power to abolish slavery within the District; and it had been urged, on the other hand, that it was necessary that Congress should have this power. Mr. Madison, the author and finisher of the Constitution itself, in that convention, as well as in the Federalist, maintained, unequivocally, not only that Congress had the power, by this provision of the Constitution, but that Congress ought to have this power over slavery—that it was necessary, that it was wise. And Mr. Madison said that he had expected that this principle was one which would commend itself to the good sense of every man. Well, they had petitions from all parts of the country, and certainly from many of the slaveholding States, upon this subject; and members who now came out and told them that Congress had no power to abolish slavery, had themselves presented petitions asking this very thing. The gentleman from North Carolina himself, (Mr. Saunders,) who had attempted to get the floor upon this question, and whom Mr. H. hoped to hear, a few years since had presented a petition for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. This would seem to be an admission, on his part, at least, that it was constitutional, whatever might have been his views on the subject of expediency, at that time. He had supposed that Congress possessed this power; he had supposed then, unquestionably, that the right of petition extended so far as to have the petition received and considered; and Mr. H. hoped and trusted at the present time, if the gentleman addressed the House, he would advance no views in opposition to the ground he had taken at that time.

There had been, continued Mr. H. in the action of this body, an express recognition of its power over the subject of slavery, and of the slave-trade. The abolition of the slave-trade by Congress, in 1808, was a full and perfect admission, on the part of Congress, that the whole subject came within their jurisdiction.

In the remarks Mr. H. made upon this subject, he wished it to be distinctly understood, and he would state here in advance, for that purpose, that he did not pretend that this government had anything to do with slavery within the States. The States were sovereign, touching the subject within their own territories. And when he spoke of the power of Congress, he wished it distinctly understood that he did not presume to advance the sentiment that Congress had this power within the States. But, within the territories, and in this district, he contended that Congress had precisely the same power as the States had, within the limits of their jurisdiction. Whenever gentlemen assumed the ground that slavery did not come within the purview of legislation, he asked them to reconcile the legislation in their own States—and he cared not from what State they came—with this broad denial of the powers of Congress in this district. It had been admitted, as Mr. H. had before said, by every State, probably, (he had not looked into the laws of all the States, but he had into the laws of several of the principal States;) he assumed it as unquestionably true, that there was not a single State in the Union but had, by its own legislative action, admitted that this whole subject came legitimately within the purview of the law-making power.

Mr. Belser (Mr. H. yielding for an explanation) said that there was no such provision in the constitution of Alabama, as had been stated by the gentleman.

Mr. Hudson said he had spoken with a little qualification. His impression had been that that provision existed in Alabama. Such provisions, however, existed in the constitutions of some of the States, and they were an express admission—a constitutional recognition—of the power of the legislatures of those States to abolish slavery therein, were it not for those provisions.

In relation to this subject, Mr. H. might quote the names of some of the first and principal men in our country. In fact, there was not a statesman known in our history, who had been connected with the legislation of this country, but had, either directly or indirectly, admitted that the subject of slavery came fairly and legitimately within the constitutional powers of Congress in this District. Why the ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the northwest territory? What was it but the express admission of the power of a legislative body over slavery within its own jurisdiction? And as that power had been exercised under the confederation, when the powers of the federal government were limited, compared with what they were under the Constitution, he trusted that no gentleman would contend, for a single moment, that they had less power over this subject under the Constitution, than they had under the articles of confederation.

But the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Duncan) had told them that they had no constitutional right to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the people of the District. The gentleman had admitted that, whenever the people asked for the exercise of this power, they had full power in the premises—that they had the right to abolish slavery. To Mr. H. this was rather a singular constitutional power. The ground was, that Congress did not possess the power—that it could not legitimately act on the subject, unless asked by petition; and that a petition sent into this House for this object, gave Congress the power and the constitutional right to do that, on a general subject, which the Constitution prohibited, without their consent. Why, that was converting the Constitution into the mere will of the people, as it might happen to express itself at a given time. According to that doctrine, a thing might be constitutional to-day, and unconstitutional to-morrow, as the thing might happen. If they could operate upon the minds of the people, and move the mass so as to induce them to ask for the exercise of this power, then that became perfectly constitutional which, without it, would be unconstitutional.

They had been told upon this subject, justly and truly, that they stood in a peculiar relation to this District; that they were not only the representatives of their respective States, and were called on to legislate for the Union, but that in a certain sense they were local legislators for this District; and from this view of the subject it was inferred that they must consult the inhabitants of this District, and their views, before acting upon questions in which their interests were involved. Mr. H. would ask if this had been the case heretofore? or had this doctrine been started for the purpose of applying to this particular question? At the last session of Congress they had abolished the sale of lottery tickets in this District prospectively, and he asked them whether they had gone out into the streets and asked the people whether they desired that measure? Or had they sent in their petitions for this purpose, to this hall? They had not.

The committee for the District of Columbia, believing that the influence of the sale of lottery tickets was pernicious, had acted as they should act; had taken the subject into their hands, and had provided by law for the prohibition of that sale.—Mr. H. referred also to another case—to the bill of the last Congress, for the extension of the right of suffrage in Alexandria, which had passed not only not in accordance with the petitions of the inhabitants of that city, but in opposition to their express remonstrances against it; and said that the very gentlemen—gentlemen, some of whom he saw before him—who, on the subject now before them, told them that they had no power to act in this case without the consent of the people of the District, had gone in direct opposition to the wishes of the people of Alexandria in that case. If they could reconcile their votes on that subject with the views they had advanced with reference to this subject, he would like to hear it explained. Were the wishes of the people to be consulted upon no subject except the subject of slavery?

Mr. H. admitted that their views and feelings should be consulted upon this subject, but not that they should be paramount in the case. If they found, as the committee of the last Congress had found, that there was anything existing in the District which was a public nuisance, which was an injury to the whole community, they had the right to abate that nuisance, though ninety-nine hundredths of the people of the District remonstrated against it. Mr. H. would consult their views, as far as he could consistently with the great interests of the country; but when the cause of humanity, when the interest, and he had almost said the durability of the country, was involved in the question, he contended that the views of individuals residing in this District, should yield to the considerations thus controlling in their character.

They frequently were asked, upon this subject, whether they supposed that the States of Maryland and Virginia would have ceded to the United States this District, if they had believed, at the time, that Congress would abolish slavery in it? Why, (said Mr. H.) at that time, Maryland and Virginia were both moving on this subject; both admitted that slavery was an evil; both regretted its existence within their own territories; and both took measures, either directly or indirectly, to abolish it within their own jurisdiction. Now, taking their action at that time—taking the views of their leading men as exponents of their views, upon this subject—the presumption was, that they would have ceded this District under that expectation, and probably that was the expectation at the time. But suppose it was not—suppose that the thought had never entered their minds—were they to be prohibited from acting on this subject (inquired Mr. H.) as they would act on other subjects?

Suppose (said Mr. H.) I ask you to sell me a portion of your farm. You know very well, when I purchase the premises, it becomes mine, and I may convert it to any use I please. This you are supposed to know; this you do know, when you sell the possession to me; and so in this case. The Constitution certainly provided that if a ten miles square was given to Congress, the fee should be in them absolutely and perfectly, so far as legislation was concerned. It was ceded by these States, with their eyes open. Virginia admitted that this was the case, because it was fully discussed in the convention of Virginia which adopted the Constitution. The leading statesmen of that distinguished commonwealth, Patrick Henry among others, had contended against it, were opposed to Congress possessing this power, and objected to this clause of the Constitution, because it gave the power to them. Madison, on the other hand, had contended that the power given in this clause of the Constitution, was right and proper, and necessary in the case.

It came, then, (said Mr. H.) with a very ill grace from Maryland or Virginia, at the present time, to say that if they had supposed that Congress would abolish slavery in the District, they would never have ceded it. These States, admitting that Congress had full jurisdiction over the question, had given these deeds of cession, and these deeds of cession contained no limitations in the case. It had been asserted frequently that there were limitations in them. So far as the subject of slavery was concerned, there was no limitation whatever; and if there had been limitations, if Congress took possession of this District rightfully, it took possession under the clause of the Constitution, which declared that it should allow no limitations—that it should allow no other power, State, or body under heaven, to exercise concurrent jurisdiction in the premises; that they should have absolute, "exclusive jurisdiction in all cases whatsoever." The deed of cession on the part of Maryland, contained no kind of limitation whatever. So far as there was any limitation in the deeds of cession, therefore, it applied exclusively to Virginia. And how was it with Virginia? Why, she had given to the United States, "in full and absolute right"—(such was the language of her deed upon the subject, conforming almost precisely with the language of the Constitution on this subject.) Now, suppose that Virginia, after declaring that she gave her portion of the District "in full and absolute right" to Congress——

Mr. H. had not yet concluded, when the morning hour having expired, the House passed to the orders of the day.

FRIDAY, Jan. 19.

Mr. Hudson (who held the floor from yesterday) resumed and concluded his remarks.

He said that when his remarks had been arrested yesterday, by the expiration of the morning hour, he was remarking that there were no limitations in the acts of cession of the States of Virginia and Maryland. And before he pursued this subject, he would correct a mistake which he found he had made at that time.

By looking into official documents, he had found that a subsequent act of the legislature of Maryland, copied the precise language used by the legislature of Virginia in their act of cession. So that, if there was any limitation which went to deny to Congress the power of legislating upon this subject in the act of Virginia, precisely the same provision would be found in the last act of Maryland, ratifying the transfer of her portion of the District. Mr. H. read this provision from the deeds of cession, which, he said, was the only one that could be denominated a limitation of this grant: "*Provided*, that nothing herein contained, shall be construed to vest in the United States any right of property in the soil, or to affect the rights of individuals therein," (i. e. in the soil, said Mr. H.) The limitation, then, was, that while they provided that this territory should be transferred to the United States, and that the United States should have exclusive jurisdiction, the only qualification was, that this act should not be so construed as to give to the United States any right to the soil of the District, or to the interest of individuals in the soil. Now, this was precisely what Mr. H. supposed would have been the fact if there had been no such provision, because the transfer did not refer to the right of property. The Constitution never contemplated that the United States should possess all the property in the District, but that they should have exclusive jurisdiction, leaving the owners of the soil in the same possession of it as they would have been had no transfer been made, and subjecting the individuals, so far as their rights were concerned, to no other laws than those which Congress might constitutionally pass upon the subject of slavery, or any other subject whatever, which came legitimately within the jurisdiction of the law-making power. So that, in fact, all that might be said of it was this: the Constitution of the United States gives to Congress over this District exclusive jurisdiction—that is, such jurisdiction as excludes the jurisdiction of any other State; and the United States had the same sovereign power in this District that the sovereign States of this Union had within their own territorial limits. If sovereignty did not rest in Congress, then sovereignty was annulled in the District, the States having surrendered their power over it

Gentlemen had, in several instances, regretted that this subject had been brought before the House for discussion, and regarded it as a violation of the Constitution itself, and had asked whether the framers of the Constitution could ever have anticipated such scenes as they were now called on from day to day to witness upon this floor? Mr. H. would say to gentlemen in this House, that the framers of the Constitution did contemplate precisely such discussions, and the individuals who framed the Constitution had entered into discussions of this character. During the first Congress, the subject of slavery was discussed by southern gentlemen, as fairly and as fully, as it had been during the present session; and the very first act passed in Congress after the qualifying of its members, was for the imposition of duties on importations; and it was moved by a respectable gentleman from Virginia, to——

Mr. Dromgoole here interposed, and addressed a remark to Mr. Hudson, which was inaudible at the reporter's desk.

Mr. Hudson said every gentlemen who had witnessed this debate knew that it had not been confined to the District of Columbia. The subject of slavery in general, and the powers of Congress here and elsewhere, had been called into question; and so wide a range had the discussion taken, that one gentleman had gone into an abstract discussion of slavery, and had told them that it was tolerated by the laws of God and man. Mr. H's. reply to such declarations as this was, that, during the first Congress, when a motion had been made to impose a duty on the importation of slaves, it had been made by a gentleman from Virginia, and it had been opposed by a gentleman from Georgia. And Mr. Madison, the author of the Constitution, had advanced a sentiment much broader than any he had heard on this floor during this discussion. He had contended that Congress had the power and the right to legislate on the subject of the importation of slaves; and he also contended that slavery was an evil, and it was a curse, and that it tended to weaken any State where it existed; and he had made an argument to this effect: that, inasmuch as Congress was bound by the Constitution to assist any State in putting down an insurrection or invasion, and inasmuch as slavery weakened a State, and threw into it the elements which would lead to an insurrection, therefore Congress had cognizance of this subject, and might exercise a preventive power to remove the cause leading to this effect. Here was a sentiment broader than anything that had been advanced on this floor, and which would cover the whole subject of slavery in the States as well as in the District. Why, in the legislature of Virginia, within a very few years, the subject of slave representation had been agitated.

It had been admitted by several gentlemen that the South had made a false issue before the country on the right of petition. That, Mr. H. believed, was admitted by southern gentlemen themselves. And let him say to southern gentlemen, they would find that their issue on the power of Congress over this District was equally false; and just so certain as they trusted themselves in a discussion of it, just so certain it was—

The hammer of the Speaker here fell, announcing the termination of the hour, and Mr. H. resumed his seat.

From the New-York Tribune.

LETTER FROM CASSIUS M. CLAY.

LEXINGTON, KY. March 20, 1844.

W. I. McKinney, esq. Mayor of Dayton, Ohio.

DEAR SIR—Your letter of February 15th last, was in due time received, and I have waited thus long, with the intention of not answering it at all; because, as I am a private citizen, not seeking office at the hands of the people, it might seem to place me in the presumptuous attitude of attempting to influence, by mere weight of opinion, the votes of my countrymen in their choice of President; when neither my age, experience, nor fame, warranted the assumption. But since the reception of your letter, I have received many of similar import, from liberty men, and anti-slavery whigs, in most of the northern States, pressing upon me an expression of opinion, in such a manner that I should prove false to that spirit of candor, which I proudly cherish as characteristic of the principles which I advocate, did I, through any affectation of humility, remain longer silent. You ask me, "Will you, if you live, and are able to vote at the approaching presidential election, vote for Henry Clay for President? If the third party, or liberty men, should have an electoral ticket in your State, would you vote that ticket in preference? Were you a citizen of Ohio, which of these tickets would you vote?" The last two questions are such as would require curious other suppositions to be made, before I could give a suitable answer in justice to myself and all the parties concerned, which would be too voluminous for the space of a single letter; and, for all practical purposes, they will be sufficiently answered in my reply to the first question—that, *it is my most decided determination "to vote for* HENRY CLAY *for President."* Men never have, and never will, in all cases, think alike; all government is necessarily a sacrifice, to some extent, of individual will; that is the best government to each individual, which fosters or allows the most of what that individual believes to be conducive to his best interests. The question, then, is not, "Can I find some man to vote for, among seventeen millions, who thinks, in all respects, as myself?" but, "Who is the man, all things present and remote considered, that will most probably be able, by success, to give effectuation to those great measures which I deem conducive to my welfare, and the welfare of my whole country?" This question every voter in the republic must determine for himself. For myself, after looking calmly upon all the surrounding circumstances, conscience, patriotism, and (if others prefer the term) enlightened self-interest, constrain me to vote for Henry Clay. The tariff, the currency, the lands, economy, executive and ministerial responsibility, and many other interests, all depend, in my humble judgment, on Mr. Clay's election, for beneficial determination. And if he is elected, the decision of 1840, passed by the people, will be confirmed, and the policy of the country settled. Then, and (such is the anarchy of the public mind) not till then, shall we have time to look about us, and project that other great reform, the reduction of American slavery to its constitutional limits, and to concentrate the united condemnation of the civilized world to its final and utter extinction.

Mr. Clay is indeed a slaveholder; I wish he were not. Yet it does not become *me*, who have so lately ceased to be a slaveholder myself, to condemn *him*. It is not my province to defend Mr. Clay; this he is abundantly able to do himself. It remains with posterity to determine how much shall be due him for the glorious impulse his fervent spirit has given to liberty throughout the world; and with them also to say, how much shall be subtracted from this appreciation, for his having only failed to do all that could be done in this holy cause. Cyrus, Themistocles, Plato, Cato, Aristides, Demosthenes, Cincinnatus, and Cicero, sacrificed to base heathen gods; yet no man, because they knew not the true God, will say that they were not religious, great, good, and patriotic men. T. B. Macauley, one of the most acute and enlightened men of this or any era, in his review of the life of Francis Bacon, justly says:

> "We should think it unjust to call St. Louis a wicked man, because, in an age in which toleration was generally regarded as a sin, he persecuted heretics. We should think it unjust to call Cowper's friend, John Newton, a hypocrite and a monster, because, at a time when the slave-trade was commonly considered by the most respectable people as an innocent and beneficial traffic, he went, largely provided with hymn-books and hand-cuffs, on a Guinea voyage. An immoral action being in a particular society generally considered as innocent, is a good plea for an individual who, being one of that society, and having adopted the notions which prevail among his neighbors, commits that action."

I cannot, then, because Mr. Clay is a slaveholder, in a community where the whole Christian Church of all denominations—the only professed teachers of morals among the people—are also slaveholders, proscribe him, for that single thing of difference between us.

In saying thus much in justification of my course in voting for Mr. Clay, I should be false to my own reputation, ungrateful to that large portion of anti-slavery men who have sympathized with me in my feeble efforts in the cause of universal liberty, and recreant to that glorious cause itself, if I did not avow my belief that the time is near at hand when public sentiment will not, ought not, and cannot hold the slaveholder guiltless—yes, I will go yet farther, and declare, in the name of the Christian religion, and our republican institutions, based professedly on the principle of "the greatest good to the greatest number," that no man, after the next presidential election, when so much light shall have been shed upon this subject, should be deemed fit to rule over a republican, Christian people, who shall violate, by holding slaves, the only two principles upon which either Christianity or republicanism can stand the test of philosophical scrutiny, for a single moment.

In conclusion, in refutation of the slanders of the Washington Globe, which are ever harmless where that print is known, in justice to Mr. Clay, and in vindication of my own self-respect, you will allow me to say, that my opinions, and my action upon the subject of slavery, are all my own; that, however much I may esteem Mr. Clay as a man, a statesman, and a friend—though I may regard him as one of the most frank, noble, practical, wise, eloquent, and patriotic of those who, in this or any other age, have assumed to govern a great nation, the editor of the Globe but makes exhibition of his own ignoble spirit, when he insinuates that Henry Clay would play a double part to deceive the American people, by dictating to me; or that I, humble as I may be in the estimation of my country, would be used by him, or any other man, or set of men, for any dishonorable purpose, or be treated with upon any other terms than those of absolute equality.

Trusting that your wishes, as well as the purposes of those persons who have done me the honor to address me by letter upon this subject, will be best subserved by making this answer public, I send it at once to the press.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. M. CLAY.

P.S. Reform, in Jeremy Bentham's day, was termed "innovation;" this owl-faced age has improved in this respect; now, "fanaticism" is the word—a strong word—yet, when will Americans learn it! there is a still stronger word than this—"*Truth.*" If there be really in all this wide Union a single man of the McDuffie school, of good sense, cool, calculating, quick in the discernment of the "pith of things," and above all no "enthusiast," let him read Thomas Carlyle's "*Sphinx*," in the "Past and Present," and then tell us whether there be a "Sphinx" also in America; and solve us the riddle! The description covers four pages; will not "the land of tracts" look to it?

C. M. C.

GENERAL JACKSON ON THE TEXAS QUESTION.

HERMITAGE, February 12, 1844.

MY DEAR SIR:—Yours of the 23d ultimo, has been received, and with it the Madisonian, containing Governor Gilmer's letter on the subject of the annexation of Texas to the United States.

You are not mistaken in supposing that I have formed an opinion on this interesting subject. It occupied much of my attention during my presidency, and I am sure has lost none of its importance by what has since transpired.

Soon after my election, in 1829, it was made known to me by Mr. Erwin, formerly our minister at the court of Madrid, that whilst at that court he had laid the foundation of a treaty with Spain, for the cession of the Floridas, and the settlement of the boundary of Louisiana, fixing the western limit of the latter at the Rio Grande,* agreeably to the understanding of France—that he had written home to our government for powers to complete and sign this negotiation; but that, instead of receiving such authority, the negotiation was taken out of his hands, and transferred to Washington, and a new treaty was there concluded, by which the Sabine, and not the Rio Grande, was recognized and established as the boundary of Louisiana.

Finding that these statements were true, and that our government did really give up that important territory, when it was at its option to retain it, I was filled with astonishment. The right to the territory was obtained from France; Spain stood ready to acknowledge it to the Rio Grande; and yet the authority asked by our minister to insert the true boundary was not only withheld, but in lieu of it, a limit was adopted which stripped us of the whole of the vast country lying between the two rivers.

On such a subject, I thought with the ancient Romans, that it was right never to cede any land or boundary of the republic, but always to add to it by honorable treaty, thus extending the arena of freedom; and it was in accordance with this feeling that I gave our minister to Mexico instructions to enter upon a negotiation for the retrocession of Texas to the United States.

This negotiation failed, and I shall ever regret it as a misfortune to both Mexico and the United States. Mr. Gilmer's letters present many of the considerations which, in my judgment, rendered the step necessary to the peace and harmony of the two countries; but the point in it at that time, which most strongly impelled me to the course I pursued, was the injustice done to us by the surrender of the territory, when it was obvious that it could have been retained without increasing the consideration afterwards given for the Floridas. I could not but feel that the surrender of so vast and important a territory was attributable to an erroneous estimate of the tendency of our institutions, in which there was mingled somewhat of jealousy to the rising greatness of the South and West.

But I forbear to dwell on this part of the history of this question. It is past, and cannot now be undone. We can now only look at it as one of annexation, if Texas presents it to us; and if she does, I do not hesitate to say that the welfare and happiness of our Union require that it should be accepted.

If in a military point of view alone, the question be examined, it will be found to be most important to the United States to be in possession of that territory.

Great Britain has already made treaties with Texas; and we know that that farseeing nation never omits a circumstance in her extensive intercourse with the world, which can be turned to account in increasing her military resources. May she not enter into an alliance with Texas? and reserving (as she doubtless will) the northwestern boundary question as a cause of war with us whenever she chooses to declare it, let us suppose that, as an ally with Texas, we are to fight her! Preparatory to such a movement, she sends her 20,000 or 30,000 men to Texas; organizes them on the Sabine, where supplies and arms can be concentrated before we have even notice of her intentions; excites the negroes to insurrection; the lower country falls, and with it New Orleans; and a servile war rages through the whole South and West.

In the meanwhile she is also moving an army along the upper western frontier from Canada, which, in co-operation with the army from Texas, spreads ruin and havoc from the lakes to the Gulf of Mexico.

Who can estimate the national loss we may sustain, before such a movement could be repelled with such force as we could organize on short notice?

Remember that Texas borders upon us, on our west, to forty-two degrees of north latitude, and is our southern boundary to the Pacific. Remember, also, that if annexed to the United States, our western boundary would be the Rio Grande, which is of itself a fortification, on account of its extensive, barren, and uninhabitable plains. With such a barrier on our west, we are invincible. The whole European world could not, in combination against us, make an impression on our Union. Our population on the Pacific would rapidly increase, and soon be strong enough for the protection of our eastern whalers, and, in the worst event could always be sustained by timely aids from the intermediate country.

From the Rio Grande, over land, a large army could not march, or be supplied, unless from the gulf by water, which, by vigilance, could always be intercepted; and, to march an army near the gulf, they could be harrassed by militia, and detained until an organized force could be raised to meet them.

But I am in danger of running into unnecessary detail, which my debility will not enable me to close. The question is full of interest, also, as it affects our domestic relations, and as it may bear upon those of Mexico to us. I will not undertake to follow it out to its consequences in those respects, though I must say that, in all its aspects, the annexation of Texas to the United States promises to enlarge the circle of free institutions, and is essential to the United States, particularly as lessening the probabilities of future collision with foreign powers, and giving them greater efficiency in spreading the blessings of peace.

I return you my thanks for your kind letter on this subject, and subscribe myself, with great sincerity,

Your friend and obedient servant,

ANDREW JACKSON.

Hon. A. V. BROWN.

P. S. The papers furnished me by Mr. Erwin, to which I have referred in this letter, can be placed in your possession, if desired.

---

* That this boundary could have been obtained, was doubtless the belief of our minister in Spain; but the offer of the Spanish government was probably the Colorado—certainly a line far west of the Sabine.

From the National Intelligencer.

THE TEXAN QUESTION—ITS HISTORY.

In our late article communicating to our readers the news, which had astounded us, that a negotiation had been brought nearly to a conclusion for the "annexation" of Texas to the United States, we supposed the first overture by this government to that of Texas, to have been probably made soon after the retirement of Mr. WEBSTER from the Department of State. Since the publication of that article, however, in tracing back, through the file of the government paper, the history of this extraordinary *negotiation* to the earliest indication of it, we find (among many things which certainly would have awakened suspicion, could such a thing have been within belief as the scheme which is now in the course of development) evidence, circumstantial, but apparently conclusive to our minds, that the project of "annexation" did not take root in the cabinet *until after the death of* Mr. LEGARE, who succeeded Mr. WEBSTER in charge of the Department of State.

The first allusion to Texas, founded upon pretended belief of certain designs of Great Britain in regard to Texas, is to be found under the editorial head of the *Madisonian* of June 24, being the same number of that paper in which, after the death of Mr. LEGARE, the appointment of Mr. UPSHUR as his successor is announced. In that article we discover the germ of the project for the acquisition of Texas, wrapped up in a parcel of sounding phrases, importing the opinion of the writer that a contest might be at hand, arising out of the relations of Texas to other nations, not to cease "until the whole continent of America belonged to the United States." How could we, or how could anybody in his right senses, regard this sort of bluster in any other light than that, in which it was regarded by everybody at the time, of mere empty bravado?

The first introduction into the official paper of a direct suggestion of the annexation of Texas which we discover, is on the 30th of August following, in the form of a short essay, copied from the New-York "Aurora," the object of which was to show "why Texas ought to be admitted into the Union." But, after one or two intervening similar publications, it is announced in the Madisonian on the 27th of September that "General MURPHY, [the Chargé d'Affaires of the United States,] at the capital of Texas, had been fully instructed of the estimate placed by the government of the United States" upon the indication furnished by the declaration, by some member of the British House of Peers, of the great wish which he felt for the abolition of slavery in Texas. We do not see how the expression of such a wish by a member of parliament concerned this government at all: we should be very sorry certainly, on many accounts, if the speeches of individual members of our Senate or House of Representatives were to be considered as indications of the fixed purposes, or even probable designs, of this government: but the President, viewing the matter differently, it seems, *instructed* General MURPHY, to what extent we can only conjecture, but not so far probably at that time, as to authorize him to invite a proposition from Texas for annexation. The scheme began to ferment, however; for, soon after this instruction, viz. on the 12 of October, we find published a speech delivered on some public occasion in Virginia by Mr. Ex-Speaker HUNTER, and a letter from Mr. WISE, strongly in favor of the annexation of Texas, in support of which "the whole South" are invoked to go in a body.

On the 3d of November, we arrive, as we suppose, at the commencement of this negotiation. "From the most authentic sources," says the official paper of that date, "we have assurances that the *people* of Texas, [not the *government* of Texas, observe,] earnestly desire the annexation to the United States." Commenting on this "authentic" information, and aware, to all appearance, of what is in contemplation, the government paper promises "the plaudits of the country, both present and future," to him or them who shall be able to contribute most to an object "so advantageous to the Union, and so anxiously desired by the Texans," as "annexation."

The third of November, therefore, was, as nearly as we can ascertain, the date of the first direct overture made to the Texan authorities, apprizing them of the design of the President, and inviting their cooperation in them.

After this date, is kept up, in the government paper, a regular fire of annexation articles, evidently, we can now perceive, from official and semi-official sources, though then so little thought to be anything more than the speculations of interested or visionary persons, as we have already heretofore taken occasion to say that we did not read any part of them except the head-lines. Nor was our attention roused to what was really going on until, in the Madisonian of December 1, (the Friday before the meeting of Congress,) appeared an article reproaching this paper (and the Globe,) in direct reference to the rumored proposition for the annexation of Texas, with "keeping their [our] readers in as profound ignorance of the approaching agitation of a most important national measure, as they are [were,] of the secret movements and intrigues of the cabinet at St. Petersburg;" a most unhappy illustration certainly—including at once a confession of *secret movements* and *intrigues* for the "annexation," and an assimilation of the executive authority in this government to that of the absolute emperor in the government of Russia. This, then, was the first direct avowal of the measure of "annexation" being meditated by the President and his cabinet; and the use of the term *approaching agitation* at once led us, and the public generally, to suppose that the recommendation of the measure was forthcoming in the President's message to Congress. We believe, for our part, that, when that article was penned, the recommendation was, in one form or other, actually *in the message*, but was stricken out of it on the Saturday following, either upon reconsideration, or upon news received in the intervening time from Texas unfavorable to the immediate presentation of it. We believe so, from the fact, among other circumstances, that the message contained a dissertation concerning the relations between Texas and Mexico, apparently without any object, and having all the appearance of an elaborately-wrought pedestal to a dismounted statue—the statue in this case being, as we suppose, the "most important national measure" referred to in the official gazette.

Be this as it may, whether because of discouragement by the government of Texas, or from whatever other cause, the tone of the message fell short of the promise of the Madisonian, and after an abortive attempt of the "friends of Texas," through the means of a certain "Extra" distributed from the office of the government paper among the members of Congress, to get up the question in Congress, the project seemed to be at rest.

Some time thereafter, however, a special messenger was, it appears, despatched from the Department of State for Texas, with some other proposition or suggestion to the government of Texas. He arrived on his final visit (as we learn from the Houston Telegraph) at the seat of government of Texas on the 17th of last month, bearing "dispatches relative to the negotiation now in progress respecting annexation," which dispatches were said to be "favorable." This bearer of dispatches (Mr. TODD) returned to this city (Washington) about the 10th of this month, and is supposed to have brought the ultimatum of General HOUSTON, and the information of the appointment of Mr. HENDERSON to be an associate with Mr. VAN ZANDT, for the completion of the treaty upon terms already agreed upon.

We have been thus particular in sketching for our readers the history of this transaction from such materials as are within our reach or knowledge, because it may happen, in the course of events, that no official account of it will be given, for the present at least. General HOUSTON, it is supposed, withheld the proposition solicited from him by this government until he received assurances, upon which he placed reliance, that two-thirds of the Senate of the United States were prepared to consent to a treaty for the annexation of Texas to the United States. It may be that the ministers of Texas to this government are instructed to sign the treaty only upon this information being verified to them here; that, if convinced of the erroneousness of this information, they may decline to sign the treaty; and that, therefore, the incidents of the negotiation, and the particulars of the treaty, may remain shrouded in the mystery which now veils them.

But, without indulging in further speculation or conjecture as to the event of this extraordinary negotiation, we invite the attention of the reader to a brief view of the circumstances under which it has been originated and thus far prosecuted.

In what *public necessity*, let us first inquire, has this negotiation had its origin? In the existing relations between the United States and the rest of the world, what was there to require of the President to exercise the power—admitting for argument's sake his right to do so—of proposing to a foreign state to be annexed to the United States? [We pass by for the present the question, what advantages, possibly to ensue to the United States from the annexation, could compensate for the evil of weakening the physical strength of the Union by extending its territory, and for the expenditure necessary to discharge all the debts and obligations of that government, to provide for its future government, and to maintain the possession of it; because these are considerations which regard the expediency, and not the necessity of the proposed "annexation."] Had the question of "annexation" been an open question between the two nations: had it been heretofore the subject of protracted but now suspended negotiation between them—we could comprehend that an extreme case, occurring in the recess of the Senate, might have justified the President in assuming the responsibility of reopening and bringing to a close the negotiation thus suspended. But this was not the fact. There was no pending negotiation for "annexation;" there was no such question between the two governments. The proposition for annexation had never been for a moment entertained by this government. When proposed for discussion by the government of Texas seven years ago, it was decisively repelled, and the doors of the department of State closed against it. In reply to the letter of the Texan envoy on that occasion, Mr. Secretary FORSYTH said that if the overture of the government of Texas "were to be *even reserved for future consideration*," it would imply a disposition wholly at variance with the spirit of our treaty with Mexico, &c.; and, in reply to a call upon the President by the House of Representatives more than a year afterward for copies of any further correspondence between this government and Texas, or any other country, on this subject, Mr. FORSYTH reported that all the correspondence upon the subject was already before the House of Representatives, and that "the proposition of annexation made by the Texan government, having been *disposed of* in that correspondence, *has not been since deemed within the control of the United States.*" The question was therefore not reserved for future negotiation; it was disposed of, and placed beyond the control of this government.

Neither in the actual circumstances of Texas, in relation to the United States or to Mexico, has any change occurred, since this ground was taken, to justify a departure from it. Then, as now, we had diplomatic relations with the republic of Texas; but neither then or now did (or does) the existence of such relations imply any guaranty of its independence, or any obligation, on our side, to take part in its affairs. The interchange of ministers, establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries, involves no cognizance of the question whether those exercising the government have the right along with the possession. The question as to right of possession then existing between Texas and Mexico, remains, we are sorry to say, just where it was. War for that right yet continues between Mexico and Texas; war which ought long ago to have ceased, and which, if Mexico had consulted her own interests and the wishes of the world, she would long ago have put an end to entirely, as she has in fact now for a time suspended it. The argument of Mr. Forsyth upon this state of things remains therefore in full force.

It has been asserted, indeed, that designs upon Texas, have been entertained by Great Britain; but this is assertion merely, and is, as far as we have any information on the subject, a mere pretense set up by those who are sadly in want of some plausible excuse for attempting to saddle this government with the public debt, the existing war, and the care of the various interests, public and private, of the government and people of Texas. We have no evidence whatever, of any design on the part of the British government to interfere with the political relations of Texas. It is stated, indeed, in a letter from this city, published in the New-York Tribune of Thursday morning last, upon what is said to be be unquestionable authority, that "Mr. Packenham, [the new minister from Great Britain,] soon after he was accredited here, passed to the Secretary of State a disavowal on the part of the British government of any view whatever of acquiring Texas, or interfering in any manner with her independence." This information is, we presume, to be relied upon. But no one, whose prejudice is not too much for his reason, needed any such assurance to satisfy him of the fact. Whatever dreams philanthropists and philosophers in England, may indulge in with regard to the domestic institutions of Texas, the interest of the government of Great Britain lies in her commercial, and not political relations with Texas. Nothing, there is every reason to believe, is further from the disposition of that government, than to interfere with the government of Texas, or even to accept of a cession of the entire country, if it were gratuitously offered to her.

With reference to the general question, what course it would become the duty of the *United States* to pursue in the event of a probability of Texas falling under the dominion of any foreign power, it would be easy for us to evade direct reply, by saying that sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. For so it is. We prefer, however, to avoid misconstruction, to declare at once our opinion that the United States can never safely permit any European power to obtain a foothold in Texas.

But, were the fact other than it is, and did there exist, in the opinion of the President, an extreme case, constituting a public necessity for incorporating this foregn State into the United States, yet it must be remembered, the Senate of the United States was in session when the instructions were given, which have led to the preparation of this inchoate treaty. Was it not the bounden duty of the President, instead of withholding all knowledge of it from the body, whose *advice* as well as consent, is necessary to the conclusion of even the most insignificant convention with a foreign power, and much more of a treaty of such vital consequence as this, to have consulted the Senate before taking any action upon it? The secrecy and self-will, which so remarkably characterize this transaction, are by no means its least exceptionable features.

We have shown, however, that this overture to Texas had its origin in *no* public necessity.

The only other justification of the President's undertaking to open and conclude a negotiation, fraught with consequences more momentous than any act of this government since its foundation, would have been a settled conviction, on his part, that not a majority merely, but two-thirds at least of the people, and the States demanded this measure. Now, we ask, in what *expression or indication of the will of the States, or of the people*, is the source of this measure to be found? A search for it in the vast field of population of the United States, would be as vain as that of the ancients for the true source of the great river of Africa. Some rills of public opinion may have been discovered flowing from village springs, and, in a very few instances, perhaps from fountains more copious; but, whatever may have been the casual indications of public sentiment in favor of the measure, we find nothing worthy of being regarded as the great current of public opinion. Beyond doubt, there was no such expression or manifestation of public opinion, as could induce the President to believe that, in taking upon himself to propose an incorporation of Texas in the United States, he was carrying out the national will. He might, with equal authority, and almost equal propriety, have proposed to the republic of Hayti, on the occasion of the late revolution in its government, or to the popular party in Ireland during the late commotions there, to be "annexed" to the United States. He might have discovered persons in this country, in favor of even the first of these propositions, and for the last he would find, if we may judge from the public indications, warm and decided friends, outnumbering perhaps the known advocates of the "annexation" of Texas. So far from the public will demanding this "annexation," the question is one for the decision of which the public mind had not been prepared by such discussion as, in this country, usually precedes any great measure of public policy. It was not possible, therefore, that the President should have been able to ascertain the will of the people in regard to this measure, or even to make a reasonable guess at it.

Having established, to our own satisfaction, that there was neither any public necessity, nor any expression or indication of the will of the people requiring the President to make the advances which he has made to the government of Texas, ending in an agreement to incorporate that territory in the Union, we additionally object to the arrangement, from the beginning to the end of it, that the action of the President in regard to this matter, though within the letter of the Constitution, has not been altogether in harmony with the genius and spirit of this government.

It is a principle not to be questioned before such readers as ours, that governments are established for the national good, and are organs of the national will.

The Constitution does indeed declare that "the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, *to make treaties*," &c. But this power must be exercised by the President, on his part, with a due deference to the national will, of which he is the organ. The power to make treaties is, in the hands of the President, a representative power, and not a prerogative. It is a power which he has no right to exercise of his own mere motion, nor for his personal gratification. He can exercise it only for the national good, and in obedience to the national will, ascertained or fairly to be presumed. Admitting, without hesitation, that the President, in the case before us, intended nothing but the public good, he ought to have consulted *also* the public will, and to have taken the time and means necessary to ascertain it. There was no want of time, nor any necessity for secrecy, to prevent his doing so. In the absence of any decisive expression of the public will, the presumption was against, rather than favorable to, the course which the President has thought fit to pursue, inasmuch as there had been a general acquiescence, uninterrupted by any audible objection, in the refusal by the last administration to entertain, when offered by Texas, the very proposition which the President now has, for the United States, undertaken to ask for and accept. Under these circumstances, the President would have acted more in the spirit of the Constitution to have refrained from this negotiation, instead of pressing it.

Again: it is the most important and responsible of the executive duties, to see that the laws be faithfully executed. Treaties are a part of "the supreme law of the land." It is the bounden duty of the President to see that they are not violated or infringed. We have a treaty of peace with Mexico, which she observes with scrupulous fidelity. This treaty, according to her construction, would be broken by the annexation of Texas, which she has formally declared that she will consider, when consummated, as establishing a state of war between the United States and Mexico. If this were a mere threat, it might be well disregarded. But being nothing more than the annunciation of a principle of national law, some respect is due to it; especially when it is supported by the recorded declaration, by the Secretary of State of the United States, that the question of "annexation," under the circumstances, "necessarily involves the question of war with Mexico." The President may have been of opinion that a war with Mexico was not worth the trouble of avoiding; but he ought to have reflected that, war being the necessary consequence of the infraction of the treaty of peace, it is no prerogative of his to make or declare war. That power is, by the Constitution of the United States, lodged elsewhere than in the presidential office. It is only in monarchical governments that the power of making war and that of making treaties—both royal prerogatives—are lodged in the same hands. On this ground alone, therefore, the President, instead of precipitating a conclusion, ought, before acting in the premises, to have taken counsel from the coordinate branches of the government.

Equally silly is he who is killing his land to fill his purse, with him who killed his goose to get the golden egg.

Heavy Punishment.—J. B. Weller, member of Congress, from Ohio, was tried for his assault and battery on A. F. Shriver, the correspondent of the Baltimore Patriot, before the criminal court at Washington, on Saturday. He was convicted, and sentenced to pay a fine of *ten dollars.*

Communications.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER, GEORGE F. WHITE, AND THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

It will be recollected that Stephen S. Foster attempted to speak in Friends' meeting on Cherry street, Philadelphia, 12th month 10th, last, on the subject of abolition, which occasioned much confusion, and resulted in his being unceremoniously ejected from the meeting-house.

The following is an extract from a sermon, preached by George F. White at that time, and which has been published by the friends of the preacher. The publishers say it "has been offered to him for inspection," and add, "We are authorized by him to say, that the sentiments thus reported are his." It is a cause of deep regret that any meeting should be so totally void of religious sensibility as to tolerate such hallucination as gospel ministry.

I well know that Friends in Philadelphia have no unity with the ministry of this individual, and have not failed to make him acquainted with their views in relation to it. But in the city of New-York, where he belongs, he is held in high estimation by the generality of the members, and no matter how great the absurdity he may utter, it all seems to pass for gospel ministry. Not long since, in Rose-street meeting, in the course of his sermon, he said that "Jesus took the devil for an angel of light, and reasoned with him as a friend." I have never heard that it gave any member of that meeting uneasiness.

This extract contains some statements which appear to require notice; I shall therefore offer a few remarks in the form of notes:

"As the attribute of Divine Justice shall be revealed, you will behold an outline of principles in accordance with it, for your observance—prominent land marks, which you are not to pass in your walk among men. You will not then be found, upon a plea of religious duty, entering houses of worship, belonging to those with whom you are not in religious communion, annoying the proprietors, disturbing the worshippers—houses, for the building of which you never paid a dollar; towards the current expenses of which you never appropriated a cent. Such an act is as gross an outrage of justice, as that of entering the residence of a private family, and obtruding advice at the hearth or the board. I will, by way of illustration, state a case. I will suppose that some one philanthropist, should order drays to your wharves, and from the promiscuous merchandize there landing, should load a hogshead of sugar upon one, three tierces of rice upon another, and bales of dry goods upon a third, and send these articles to one or more of the charitable institutions of your city. When arraigned by the lawful owners of the merchandize for the theft—would a plea of conscience—of religious duty—of the inward light—avail him? I ask you would you believe there was a word—a syllable of truth in the plea? Yet this latter act would not be a greater violation of justice, than is the former. I desire to avoid making myself obnoxious to the charge of being personal, but *I must perform my duty*, and will not apologise for it. I care not by whom the act has been perpetrated—I care not by whom it shall be perpetrated—I fearlessly declare, before men and angels, that whenever it is perpetrated, it is perpetrated under a delusion of the devil. (1) I am well aware, that attempts have been made both by *ancient* and *modern slanderers*, to fasten this stigma upon the sons of the morning of our religious society. The charge made, and often repeated, is destitute of any foundation in fact. It is well known by many, who are but partially acquainted with the history of the society, that laws were in force when our early Friends formed themselves into a society for the purpose of strengthening each other's hands, to uphold certain testimonies which had been committed to them by the great head of the Church, which laws required (under grievous penalties for the omission) their attendance at the houses of worship of the established Church, during service. (2) At the same time, every member of the Church, was allowed, both by statutory law, and by usage, to mount the pew or the pulpit and preach after the priestly incumbent of the latter, had delivered his sermon. (3) It is well known, that it was a time of great religious excitement, and the houses for worship were often unshut for many consecutive days and nights; during which time, it was as common to see red coats, or military officers, in the pulpit, as it was to see black coats there. (4) But, I believe it can be established by authentic testimony, that when Friends relinquished the hope of being useful, as members of the established church, and withdrew from it, they organized a religious society, and never thereafter claimed, or attempted to exercise any right in the houses of worship of the established church, or in those of any of the dissenters, except their own. (5)

Two doctors of divinity, Bogue and Bennett, who, it cannot be supposed, were very friendly to those of our faith, admit this latter fact. And, I think the great abolitionist, Thomas Clarkson, in his portraiture, asserts the same thing. I know not, however, that I have opened one of his volumes during the last twenty years." (6)

NOTES.

(1) Here is a severe condemnation, uttered in the most solemn and positive manner, of many of the most devoted "sons of the morning of our religious society," as will appear by what follows.

(2) No such laws as are here mentioned "were in force at the time when our early Friends formed themselves into a society." Prelacy had been abolished, and the Presbyterian confession of faith substituted in the place of it; but other Christian professors were tolerated. The Church, as then established, had no power to persecute other Christians, as the Episcopal church had previously. Besides, in 1649, about a year before Friends were organized as a religious body, "all penal statutes for religion were taken away." [See Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. 4, pp. 33 and 52.] "By this law, says our author, the doors were set open, and the State was at liberty to employ all such in their service as would take the oaths to the civil government, without any regard to their religious principles."—*Ibid.*

(3) No such statute as is here mentioned ever existed.

(4) Several years previous to the period of which we are now speaking, "The army being destitute of chaplains, who might have restrained the irregularities of their zeal, the officers set up for preachers in their several regiments." During the great excitement that prevailed in the commencement of the civil war some of the meeting-houses were kept open during several consecutive days, but I believe their meetings were seldom, if ever continued after night. If G. F. White had read "Bogue and Bennett" with a little more attention, he might have discovered that the period when "red coats as well as black were seen in the pulpit" was several years antecedent to the appearance of Friends. After the death of the king, which took place in the early part of the year 1649, those matters assumed a much more orderly aspect.

(5) As soon as any individual was convinced of the principles of Friends, he withdrew from religious connection with the sect to which he previously belonged. In the course of the year 1648, many hundreds had been convinced, and divers meetings of Friends, to use the language of George Fox, "had been gathered." About the year 1650, Friends formed themselves into a society. In 1654, a meeting was settled in London, and many others in different parts of England, and in Scotland; and yet they frequently went to the meetings of other societies, and declared the Truth in them as they were moved by Divine love.

Sewel, speaking of William Caton, says: Thus advancing in godliness, he was frequently moved to go to the places of public worship, and also to markets, to warn people to repentance; but then beating and buffeting was his share," &c. &c. In the year 1654, he "declared the truth of God" to the people in the steeple-house at Wellingboro, and in London, in the same year, he was in two steeple-houses the same day and preached in both. See p. 118.

In the year 1656, James Parnell "went to Coggeshall, where the Independent professors had appointed a fast, on purpose to pray against the spreading of error, by which they meant the doctrine of the people called Quakers. The priest who officiated on the occasion, had prepared a sermon replete with the commonplace invectives against that people, the fruit of prejudice and prepossession. James Parnell being present, esteemed it his duty to vindicate himself and brethren against his opprobrious misrepresentations." "Then proceeding in his vindication of the Quakers, so called, in reply to an assertion of the priest, that they were on a sandy foundation, he signified, I am ready to prove that the Quakers are not on a sandy foundation, and that thou art a false prophet, and a deceiver," &c. &c. Upon his coming out of the steeple-house, he was apprehended, and committed to prison, where he remained till he died.—[Gough's History, vol. I. p. 182.] Perhaps Rose-street Friends might receive some instruction from this circumstance. If any person should go into their meeting and follow the example of James Parnell, if he was not committed to prison, the overseers of that meeting would doubtless inform him that the door-keepers had orders to keep him out of the house.

In the year 1657, Richard Davis was committed to prison for speaking to the priest, after he had finished his sermon, in the steeple-house in Welsh-pool, "on a law made in Oliver's days, that none were to speak to the priest or preachers, neither at their worship, nor coming and going."—[See his journal, p. 25.]

In the year 1665, Solomon Eccles went into a popish mass-house, without the gates of Galway, Ireland, and testified against their idolatry, "accompanied by three Friends, showing their unity with him."—[Besse's Sufferings, vol. II. p. 476.] The same Friend went into the cathedral at Cork, in 1670, and reproved the priest.—[Sewel's History, p. 579.]

To cite all the instances of the kind, would be to transcribe a great part of G. Fox's Journal, Sewel's History, and Besse's Sufferings. Such proceedings were as contrary to "statutory law,"* as they were to "usage." In many instances, women were found in the performance of those acts, and it will not be pretended that the "usage" of that time allowed women to speak in the Church. J. Gough says, that on these occasions, "they mostly, though not always, waited till their worship was ended."—[Vol. I. p. 86.] Bogue and Bennett, in their "History of Dissenters," vol. I. p. 166, say, "As to the plea that it was at that time admitted, especially by some of the sects, for others beside the appointed preacher to address the congregation, it may be replied, that at no time, by no society of worshippers, has it been allowed for *any* one to speak in the congregation." Those Friends believed they were acting in accordance with divine requisition, and the consequences that followed, seemed to justify such an opinion; for they were thus made instrumental in "turning thousands from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." And yet, we hear the bold and presumptuous declaration, "I care not by whom the act has been perpetrated; I care not by whom it shall be perpetrated; I fearlessly declare, before men and angels, that whenever it is perpetrated, it is perpetrated under a delusion of the devil." It cannot be supposed that any of those Friends ever "paid a dollar for the building of those houses, or contributed a cent towards the current expenses."

(6) "Bogue and Bennett" make no such admission as is here attributed to them. They say, that "The Friends soon tacitly admitted the impropriety of their conduct in disturbing the assemblies of other Christians, by the abandonment of the practice; and as their numbers increased, amidst the shameless persecution which they endured, they hired, in the year 1654, a place for their worship, called the Bull and Mouth:" [volume 1, page 168:] but they do not say that the practice was then abandoned. The case of Solomon Eccles occurred sixteen years afterwards. Compare this statement with the extract from George F. White's sermon, and see how they agree. There were more than a hundred instances, after this, of their "disturbing the assemblies of other Christians." I have examined Clarkson's Portraiture, and cannot find that he makes any such statement as is here attributed to him. It is certainly a mistake. The whole extract from G. F. White's sermon is composed of gross and palpable misrepresentations. He has made himself the "slanderer," by stigmatizing as "a delusion of the devil," a practice that has been sanctioned by the Society of Friends, from the beginning. And so far is it from being a "stigma," I consider it an evidence of the faithful devotion of those worthies, to what they believed required at their hands; and that, too, at the risk of losing their liberty, and all their worldly possessions.

I do not wish to be understood as endorsing the conduct of Stephen S. Foster, in interrupting the meeting to which this communication refers. I think it was unwise to attempt to deliver an abolition lecture in a meeting for worship; and I am satisfied that the tendency of such proceedings is injurious to the cause he wishes to promote; but I do not impugn his motives. "To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven." Much more objectionable was the scene that followed. But I would not charge the meeting with it. From what I can learn, the tumult that took place was occasioned by the indiscreet conduct of the preacher, which stimulated some hot-headed young people, of pro-slavery sentiments, who were aided by some officious individuals, not members. It appears to me, however, that it was an error to order Stephen to sit down, when he was calmly addressing the meeting on a deeply interesting subject; and the abrupt manner in which the meeting was broken up, by Friends in the preachers' gallery, I think all must admit, was extremely improper. Much better, in my opinion, would it have been to have adopted the plan of early Friends, on the like occasion. George Whitehead says, that when some busy priests came into their meetings, and made opposition and disturbance, "We would not suffer any violence to be done to any of them, in our assemblies; but civilly treated them, and soberly answered their objections, and with meekness endeavored to inform their understandings, and rectify mistakes concerning our principles." This was Christian.—[G. W.'s Journal, p. 162.]

If Friends will suffer the sacred office of the gospel ministry to be prostituted, as it often is in this city, to the slandering of individuals, and of benevolent societies, any such individual, or any member of such society that has been thus misrepresented or vilified, has a perfect right to rise in the meeting, and defend himself, or the society to which he belongs, against the unfounded charges which may have been made; common justice, and the laws of the land, will sustain him in doing so. This was a right always claimed by Friends, and frequently exercised by them. The priests were never more bitter and sarcastic towards Friends, than some ministers in that society have been towards abolitionists, the advocates of temperance, and non-resistants.

I have not written this out of any unkind feelings towards the Society of Friends, or to George F. White. I wish for nothing more sincerely and ardently, than that they should return to a right spirit.

ISAAC T. HOPPER.

---

* See Neal's History, vol. III. p. 365.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 1844

TAKE NOTICE!—There is another paper published in this city, called the New-York Standard, and letters and papers intended for us, often get miscarried to that office. Our friends and correspondents will please be sure and direct to us, as the *Anti-Slavery* Standard.

LETTERS OF THE LATE BISHOP ENGLAND,

Addressed to the Honorable John Forsyth, on the subject of slavery.

(Concluded.)

Mr. Forsyth, in an address to the people, in favor of Mr. Van Buren, on the eve of the presidential election in 1840, had spoken of the Pope's apostolical letter as a bull against "slavery," and had classed his holiness with O'Connell, and the British and American abolitionists. It is the grand object of Bishop England to separate the head of the Catholic Church from such bad company; and for that purpose, to prove that it was only the *slave-trade* that the Pope denounced and prohibited. Now, in this vindication, it is very remarkable that the bishop says not one word of the *American* slave-trade. On this topic he maintains an expressive silence. Probably nothing that we may say, can be more conclusive against that part of the American system, than this simple suppression by so distinguished an advocate of it; for certainly, since it was his precise aim to adduce every fact that would take American slavery out of the range of the condemnation fulminated by the Pope, he would have mentioned, to the same end, the American slave-trade, if by any possibility it could have been made to subserve his purpose.

When the British commissioners, in the negotiation of the treaty of Ghent, proposed that the parties should bind themselves "to use their best endeavors to accomplish the entire abolition of the traffic in slaves, as irreconcilable with the principles of humanity and justice," Mr. Clay, one of the American commissioners, objected to the article, on the ground that it would embrace the slave-trade between different States of this confederacy; and he proposed that the article should be so modified as to restrict the application of it to the *African* slave-trade. Mr. Gallatin, however, was of opinion that our commissioners ought to betray no consciousness of the existence of such a trade among ourselves, and that they should therefore accept the article as offered.

In repeating the Pope's enumeration of the several features of the slave-trade, which render it an inhuman and criminal traffic," the bishop lays great emphasis upon the following, as not identifying the condemned thing with American *slavery*—viz: "separating the negroes from their wives and children," and "carrying them into other regions." Now, it is impossible for these evils to be inflicted with more frequency and intensity, than in the American slave-trade. Indeed, Mr. Thomas Jefferson Randolph, in the celebrated debate in the Virginia legislature, consequent upon Nat Turner's insurrection, averred that the horrors of separation were much enhanced here, by reason of the superior knowledge and sensibility of those subjected to it. Had it been the bishop's purpose to arrive at truth, and not merely to maintain an argument, would he not have admitted that the Pope's censures did fall upon the American slave-trade; and, inasmuch as that trade is admitted by the slaveholders themselves to be an essential part of *slavery* itself, that therefore those censures did, to that extent, reach American "*slavery*." Mr. *Harrison*, formerly of Virginia, in a well-known essay published some years ago, in Walsh's Quarterly Review, and Mr. Wise, in his late minority report on the "21st rule," both declare, that without the slave-trade between the States, slavery must soon cease in the United States; and that the prohibition of this trade would be tantamount to the abolition of slavery. Yet Bishop England treats this trade as of so little importance, as not to allude, in any way, to its existence, either as a substantive offense, like the African slave-trade, or as a part of the "American system." The want of candor, and the narrow partisan spirit evinced by this unworthy concealment of an essential feature in the character of that system, will, we trust, put the Catholic population of the United States on their guard against the sophistry and falsities of this bishop's book.

But we undertake to maintain, with O'Connell and Mr. Forsyth, that the apostolical letter *does* condemn slavery itself; and that therefore the assertion of Bishop England, that "it would have been as just to place Mr. Van Buren and Mr. Forsyth himself in company with British and American abolitionists, as to place there his holiness, Pope Gregory XVI." is false. For a refutation of it, we refer first, to several sentences of the extract from the apostolical letter, given for another purpose, in our last. It is there stated, that slaves found the evils of their lot "alleviated" under *Christian* masters; that the universal love enjoined by the gospel of Christ, required masters to regard their slaves as "brethren," and to emancipate "those who are deserving of liberty;" and that, in point of fact, this was wont to be done, as the *very first thing*, by the early Christians, on Good Friday, the feast of the resurrection. Moreover, that there were Christians, who, being animated by a more ardent love, actually "took the chains upon themselves, that they might redeem others;" and that "the darkness of heathen superstitions being dissipated, and the manners of barbarous nations softened through faith, working by love, it came to pass that for many ages slavery scarcely had an existence among most Christian nations." He who sees nothing in all this, opposed to slavery itself, would not believe, though one were to rise from the dead.

Again, in contrast with this, the Pope declares that this happy state and tendency of the Christian world, was interrupted by some of the very number of believers who, "being wickedly blinded by a sordid love of gain," reduced to slavery negroes and others; or did not hesitate to become accessory to their crime by engaging in merchandising those reduced to captivity, in whatsoever manner they might have been so reduced. Now, without pausing to remark upon the necessary subordination of means to end—slave-trading being the means, and slavery the *end*—what was it, in the view of the Pope, which changed the face of the Christian world, (made happy by the light of the gospel, by the universal love enjoined by it toward slaves as "brethren," and by the general emancipation, which faith, working by love, had wrought,) to renewed darkness and barbarity, but the re-establishment of slavery? Is it not this entire and most disgraceful retrogression and apostacy of believers, and not simply the means by which they were brought about, which cause the "great grief" expressed by the head of the Catholic Church? It cannot be disputed, by any one, that the Pope does hold up for the admonition of modern Christians, the great fact that *Christianity* did work the abolition of the ancient chattel slavery in Europe. This achievement has always been claimed by Christian theologians, for the honor of their faith. It has also been claimed as the work of *chivalry*, in the age of the crusades; and doubtless the latter was an important instrumentality; but the bull of Pope Alexander III. issued about the middle of the twelfth century, declaring every *Christian* a *freeman*, is decisive in favor of the pretensions of the Church.

In the latter part of the apostolic letter, the Pope "admonishes and earnestly beseeches all believers in Christ not to exercise that inhuman trade, whereby negroes, as if they were not *men*, but mere animals, being reduced by any means whatsoever to slavery, are without distinction, contrary to the laws of justice and humanity, bought, sold, and *sometimes devoted to the most cruel hardships.*" This language, though used in connection with the slave-trade, must certainly have been intended to apply to the condition of slavery, and to the buying and selling of slaves everywhere. It is a condemnation of the *system*, root and branch, and follows out in the prohibitory part of the letter, the scripture doctrines of love and justice, and the Christian example of redeeming and emancipating slaves, recited in the preceding part.

But the bishop says that the apostolic letter is directed "against being engaged in the slave-trade." These he calls the enacting words, and infers that the letter cannot, therefore, apply to slavery in his diocese, containing, he tells us, "the most numerous negro slave population that is to be found in any diocese in the world." Suppose a temperance preacher should take up as his subject, the trade of distilling and vending intoxicating liquors, and for the purpose of showing the full extent of the mischief and the turpitude of this trade, should describe and denounce the deplorable and fatal consequences to individuals and families, to health, and morals, to society, and the country, resulting from intemperance—could it be said that such discourse was directed only against *distilling*, and not at all against *drunkenness?* Yet this is the exact position of Bishop England, in relation to a decree issued by the highest authority in his church.

But we have a key to this narrow interpretation of the apostolic letter, in the statement that the letter "was read and accepted in a council held at Baltimore," and that if it had been construed as condemning slavery, it would have been the duty of the bishops either to have dissented, and stated their reasons; or, if they accepted it, "to refuse the sacraments to those who should *persevere* in the immoral conduct which it denounced." Aye, there's the rub! But does it *not* denounce "the separating of negroes from their wives and children"—"the carrying or sending them to other regions"—"the buying and selling them, *however* reduced to slavery, as if they were not men, but mere animals"—and "devoting them to the most cruel hardships"—as unjust and inhuman, and therefore immoral? But to refuse the sacraments to those who are guilty of this "immoral conduct," would cause disturbance in the dioceses. "Jesus of Nazareth, why hast thou come to torment us before our time?"

It was doubtless the intention of his holiness that his clergy in this country should first preach and faithfully admonish of these "unjust and inhuman" practices, and not proceed to extremities, except with obdurate and hardened offenders. It is a perilous position for a Christian clergy to suffer themselves to slide into, that they will connive at the immorality of slavery, because a condemnation of it would involve "the refusal of the sacraments" to those who persevere in it! Yet such, as it seems to us, is the actual position of the Catholic clergy in the United States.

LETTER OF CASSIUS M. CLAY.

On another page of this paper, will be seen a letter from Cassius M. Clay, the brave and noble young Kentuckian, who has just proved the sincerity of his allegiance to free principles, by *emancipating all his slaves*, at the loss of some $40,000 of *legal* property. On no man in the whole country do we look with more respect and admiration, from no one do we hope more, in arresting the downward tendencies of our institutions.

This very letter breathes a candid, philosophic, manly spirit, which is admirable; and most becoming is the humility that leads him to forbear harsh judgment of a slaveholding relative, because he has so recently been a slaveholder himself.

But although we read the letter in the kind and candid spirit in which it was written, it nevertheless grieved us. There is obviously no intentional sophism, no wish to "blarney" the American people with regard to his distinguished relative; but it appears to us that some of his premises and conclusions are radically wrong.

He seeks to apologize for Henry Clay, on account of the blinding influence of education, habit, and surrounding opinions. These he thinks have prevented the subject of slavery from being fairly presented to his mind. But has not Cassius M. Clay himself been subjected to the same influences? And have they been effectual to blind *him* against the flood of light that has been pouring on the public mind for the last ten years? Could Henry Clay have remained impassive to all the startling facts brought forward to prove that slavery is sapping the very vitals of our free institutions, if he had not willfully determined that he *would* be deaf and blind to them all? Has he a right to be ignorant of the workings of emancipation in the West Indies? Can a man who consents to stand candidate for the chief magistracy of a nation, be justified for remaining ignorant on a subject so closely interwoven with every fibre of the public weal? To extend our charity so far as to excuse his ignorance as a citizen, is one thing; but whether it does not affect his fitness for the presidency, is quite another thing. Even if he is innocent in his ignorance, it still disqualifies him.

Cassius M. Clay says that we do not blame Plato, Themistocles, &c. for worshipping heathen gods, when they were ignorant of the true one. Very true; but if there were a proposition to ordain Plato, or Themistocles, into the *Christian ministry*, the deficiences occasioned by their education and habits of thought would very obviously unfit them for the office. Let us judge of Henry Clay, and of other slaveholders, as kindly and candidly as possible; but do not let us put them into offices where they must constantly act on the very subject on which they are blinded; and that subject, too, the very one that lies at the root of all our national difficulties.

But *is* Henry Clay so ignorant concerning the "patriarchal institution?" His nephew may believe it, but we do not. In the first place, we do not believe that he *can* be so. In the next place, we remember certain utterances of his many years ago, before the glittering bait of the presidency was before his eyes. He was then in favor of Kentucky's being a free State. "In our attempt to adopt gradual emancipation," says he, "we were overpowered by numbers, and submitted to the decision of the majority, with the grace which minority in a republic should ever yield to such a decision. But I have never ceased, and never shall cease, to regret a decision, the effects of which have been to place us in the rear of our neighbors, who are exempt from slavery, in the state of agriculture, the progress of manufactures, the advance of improvement, and the general prosperity of society."

Now, a system that he knew was so bad for Kentucky, must be bad for other States; because it must contain within itself the inherent causes of obstruction and decay. Yet, when an effort was made to call a convention to amend the constitution of Kentucky, in reference to slavery, in 1838, Henry Clay was warmly opposed to such a convention; and while the subject was under discussion in the legislature, he was very active in writing letters against the passage of the law. And in 1841, he said to Henry A. Wise, "I would suffer the tortures of the inquisition before I would sign a bill having for its object the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or in any manner give countenance to the project."

Cassius M. Clay speaks of "the glorious impulse, which the fervent spirit of Henry Clay has given to liberty throughout the world."

We remember that he said in the Senate of the United States, "I maintain that an oppressed people are authorized, whenever they can, to rise and break their fetters." But we likewise remember that he said to Mr. Mendenhall, "Go home and mind your business, my slaves are fat and sleek."

We do not forget his sympathy with the Greeks, so eloquently expressed; but unfortunately the same voice, a few years later, uttered the following absurd logic: "Discussion implies deliberation; deliberation is preliminary to action. The people of the North have no right to *act* upon the subject of southern slavery, and therefore they have no right to deliberate—no right to *discuss*."

What did Mr. Clay make of his own discussion of Turkish tyranny? Did Turkish laws give him any right to *act* in relation to their government of the Greeks? Was not "foreign interference" considered as impertinent and troublesome to Turkish tyrants, as northern remonstrance is to southern oppressors? Did Mr. Clay forget, too, that Northerners have more urgent reasons for remonstrating against American slavery, than they possibly can have for crying aloud against foreign despotism? The destinies of the North are bound up with those of the South, and we are all going to destruction together. And what is still worse, we not only see that our southern brethren are committing a grievous sin against God and man, in upholding this wicked institution, but the hearts and consciences of the North are beginning to feel pretty acutely that they stand in the relation of accomplices. If we have "no right to discuss" a question, in which conscience, character, and destiny are so closely involved, then we are indeed, as badly off as the Greeks ever were.

Politicians try all manner of means to evade this troublesome question of slavery. Horace Greely asks whether a Catholic ought to refuse to vote for a man because he is a Protestant? and *vice versa*. But the differences between sects, are mere matters of *opinion*; however important they may be in the eyes of individuals, all agree that equally good men may differ about them. It is not so with slavery. *That* is a question of *morals*, and no man is base enough to vindicate or excuse it, on any other plea than necessity.

But says Mr. Greely, again, because you are a teetotaller are you bound not to vote for a man admirably fitted for an office, because he occasionally drinks stimulating liquor?" That public men need to be strictly temperate, both for the preservation of their faculties, and the influence of their example, is most true. But slavery has another aspect than that of morality. It is a direct violation of the principles of our *government*. From the beginning to the present time, it has tangled the web of our *politics* more and more. A man might be president eight years, without baving his theological peculiarities, or individual opinions on other subjects, brought into activity in the discharge of his official duties. But slavery is *the* question, above all others, on which the destiny of the government depends. The mere circumstance of being a slaveholder unfits a man to preside over free institutions; and the sooner the people learn this, the better.

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, March 31, 1844.

Mr. Calhoun has come, and never *did* minister come to a more uncomfortable and dangerous position. The most sagacious were bewildered by his appointment, and they are still more so by his acceptance, under actual circumstances. He is to take up a negotiation, of which in the event of success, he cannot engross the glory, and of which he must take a large share of the ruin if it fails. It is as if he had been appointed cannonier to fire off the "Peacemaker," after the evil genius of another had invented and loaded it. Until the last few days I did not know but that his habitual horror of the consequences of war to the defenseless South, and to slavery; and his apprehensions from the migratory tendency of the inhabitants of the old slave States, a tendency greatly on the increase in South Carolina, might make him pause before he lent himself to the accomplishment of a scheme so certain to produce a war, of which no human eye can foresee the extent or end, and so likely to establish a steady and rapid drain of the population of his own State. But I now know by positive information, (what I *believed* before,) that his sectional policy, his passion for slavery, and his *personal ambition*, have triumphed over his State attachments, and made him an out and out advocate of annexation. In the *Richmond Enquirer* of March 22d, I find the following extract from a letter of his, addressed to the same committee in Carroll county, Kentucky, to which Mr. Walker addressed his famous pamphlet on the annexation of Texas. It is dated February 3d, 1844:

> "I received by the mail, yesterday, your letter with its enclosures. The one from the committee, in reference to Texas, of which you enclose a copy, was received some time since. I did not reply, not from want of respect, but because there was reason to believe that the subject of annexation was in discussion between the governments, and that the agitation of it might be embarrassing, without doing any good. The reason still continues, which I hope the committee will regard as a sufficient explanation of my silence. It is well known, that I have been from the first in its favor."

A stronger proof of blind and headlong haste to reach a favorite object, could not be afforded, than is found in the very publication of this letter, by so wary and practised a politician as the editor of the Enquirer. The letter is stated to have been "*private*," and on its face, it appears that it was not intended for the public eye, inasmuch as it gives the reason why the writer abstained from entering into a public correspondence on the subject—a reason which he declares to be still in force. But the friends of annexation are so madly bent upon realizing their plan, that in order to swell the current of influence and feeling, and to accelerate the irrevocable deed, they abandon their customary caution, and play the game of empire, like desperate dicers. The special minister from Texas having arrived here straight from the Hermitage, it is presumed that the action of the plot will now receive a fresh impulse. I hear that it is given out by him, that if he fails here, he is to proceed, to England, and seek protection for the republic of the lone and waning star, *there*. This of course is to feed our national jealousy of Britain. It is to drive us from coldness by coquetry.

An annunciation, deemed of considerable importance on all sides, has been made here for two or three weeks. I have not heretofore mentioned it, because I thought it originated in artifice and fraud; and I did not feel disposed to give it currency, considering that that would aid the design of the dissembler. But it has already obtained notoriety through the press, and I will now say my say about it.

The *Madisonian* of November 29th, contained the following paragraph conspicuously printed:

> "☞We understand that Colonel Benton was in the neighborhood of Lexington, Kentucky, a few days ago. We hope soon to see him working his awful battering ram against the British and abolitionists. The colonel is in favor of the annexation of Texas."

Twelve or fifteen years ago, during successive months, Lundy's paper, "The Genius of Universal Emancipation," was full of anxious warnings of the busy and dangerous agency of Benton in the plot of annexation. He had written two series of articles in a newspaper of St. Louis, Missouri, setting forth the necessity of more territory for slave States, to balance the new free States, which would be formed in the West; the necessity to the old slave States of an extended and enduring market for the slaves they are engaged in raising for exportation; and the danger of a ruinous elopement of slaves arising from the juxtaposition of a republic, which had abolished slavery. Mr. Benton argued that the acquisition of Texas, (which he said was extensive enough to form nine or ten States as large as Kentucky,) was the only possible preventive of the hopeless decadence and degradation of the noble and chivalrous South. These articles were reproduced in the Richmond Enquirer, and other Southern papers, and made a profound impression throughout that section. In them I think originated the scheme, which time and events have matured into the daring and profligate negotiation, now on hand. General Jackson, I have heretofore endeavored to show, has been the executive head of the conspiracy, and Houston has been his agent, but Benton it was who excited Jackson to the enterprise, and fired his ambition to rival the renown of Jefferson in extending the boundaries of the republic. The "old Roman" was the "battering ram" of Benton. Knowing all these things, and reposing confidence in his utter want of principle, I was prepared to hear, with perfect incredulity, but with no surprise, the declaration which he has been industriously making in private circles, and, I presume, in private letters, to his friends, at every important point, *that he is dead against annexation*. He also declares that it is a Tyler and Calhoun plot, to divide the friends of Mr. Van Buren, and also (what he does not declare,) of Van Buren's *successor*. He shows his political profligacy in suddenly abandoning his vast and long-cherished scheme of slaveholding aggrandizement the moment it threatens in its progress to thwart the ends of his personal interest and his far-reaching ambition. The colonel tries to manage his present disguise, so that he may not be taken at his word in *Missouri* and the *South*; and no doubt he gives precious explanations of it to the initiated.—Such an explanation, by great good luck, happened to come to my ear through an authentic channel. It was this, that the colonel is *not* opposed to annexation, but thinks it *too soon* to agitate it. The true interpretation of it is, "Let us keep our party together, elect our candidate, and then we can annex Texas, not only without injury, but with immortal glory to ourselves, which this wretched Tyler would now run away with, and probably presume on the strength of it to throw himself across our path."—D. L. C.

THE ANTI-DRACO.

This is the title of a periodical issued by the American Society for the Abolition of Capital Punishment. The first number, of eight pages, is occupied with Mr. O'Sullivan's very able memorial to the legislature of New-York, which we republished a short time since in our columns. It contains a condensed view of the most striking arguments for the abolition of the gallows, and forms a most excellent tract for distribution. The next number will be devoted to the objections usually urged from scripture. The Anti-Draco is a good and appropriate title. Wm. C. Bryant, the poet, is president of this society, and Mr. O'Sullivan, corresponding secretary. In an address to the public, they urge upon every friend of humanity to take immediate measures for the formation of a kindred society in his town, village, or ward, for the discussion of this important subject.

DR. LAMBERT'S LECTURE.—This gentleman has been delivering a course of lectures in this city, on Anatomy. They have been highly interesting and instructive; conveying in a popular form a great deal of information valuable for the regulation of diet, clothing, modes of life, &c. The illustration of the mechanism of the body, by the ingenious machine called a Manikin, or little man, is extremely curious and interesting. We understand that Dr. Lambert is going to repeat his lectures by request, and we advise everybody to go and hear him. He understands his subject well.

DR. ADAM.—This gentleman, lately professor of Oriental literature at Harvard University, proposes to open a school in Boston for the instruction of young ladies in English literature, general history, and the philosophy of the mind. We wish him all success; and he will be sure to have it, if excellence of character, kindness of heart, a dignified and gentlemanly deportment, extreme conscientiousness, and thorough scholarship, can secure it! Dr. Adam was many years in India, and intimately acquainted with Rammohun Roy. He needs no introduction to abolitionists; he is too extensively known as the friend of freedom and humanity.

APOLOGY.—We trust Dr. Hudson will excuse the omission of his interesting letter; we reluctantly crowded it out, to make room for documents from Washington.

☞ General Jackson's Letter, and the article from the National Intelligencer, alluded to in the editorial of last week, will be found on another page.

The request of Charles Atkinson, of Marion, Grant county, Indiana, with reference to subscriptions, is agreed to. The business has been overlooked, unintentionally.

Anti-Slavery Items.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN LORD ABERDEEN AND HON. ASHBEL SMITH, IN RELATION TO SLAVERY.

Ashbel Smith to the Earl of Aberdeen.

The undersigned, charge d'affaires of the republic of Texas, has the honor to state to his excellency, the Earl of Aberdeen, her majesty's Secretary of State for foreign affairs, that he has been informed that certain persons, British subjects, and others, now or recently in London, have been, and are endeavoring to procure the abolition of slavery in Texas; and that in pursuance of this purpose they have presented themselves to the minister of her majesty's government, in order to obtain, if possible, their co-operation on this subject.

The undersigned, on behalf of his government, would state to his lordship, that the parties alluded to as having for their object, the abolition of slavery in Texas, are in no manner recognized by the Texan government, and that their proceedings in the matter in question, as well as in all others touching, or in any way relating to the institutions of Texas, are wholly unauthorized, disclaimed, and disapproved of, by the government of that country.

In making the present communication, the undersigned begs to disclaim intimating the opinion that there exists any disposition on the part of H. B. M.'s government to interfere in the affairs of Texas, an opinion which would be wholly inconsistent with the frank and friendly tone of his lordship's remarks in the interview which the undersigned had the honor to hold with his lordship on this subject; nor does the undersigned wish or expect to interfere with the liberty of British subjects to discuss the matter in question, or any other matter; but his object is to place on record the explicit disapproval, by the Texan government, of all proceedings having for their object the abolition of slavery in Texas.

The undersigned avails himself of this occasion to renew to his excellency, the Earl of Aberdeen, assurances of the highest consideration.

(Signed) ASHBEL SMITH.

Legation of Texas, August 1, 1843.

The Earl of Aberdeen to Ashbel Smith

The undersigned, her majesty's principal Secretary of State for foreign affairs, has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the note dated the 1st ultimo, from Mr. Ashbel Smith, charge d'affaires of the republic of Texas, in which he brings under the notice of her majesty's government the proceedings of certain British subjects, and others in London, who have been, and are endeavoring to procure the abolition of slavery in Texas, and states that the persons in question are in no manner recognized by his government, who entirely disapprove of their proceedings.

In disclaiming all intention of insinuating that there exists on the part of her majesty's government, any disposition to interfere improperly in the affairs of Texas, Mr. Ashbel Smith is only rendering justice to her majesty's government. Nothing can be further from their intention, than thus to interfere in the internal affairs of Texas. But at the same time that the undersigned makes this declaration, he believes that Mr. Smith is fully aware of the continued anxiety of her majesty's government to see slavery abolished, not only in Texas, but in all parts of the world; and it is matter of no surprise to the undersigned, that private individuals, who are impressed with the same feeling, should exert every effort in their power to attain an object so desirable.

The undersigned has the honor to renew to Mr. Ashbel Smith the assurance of his consideration.

(Signed) ABERDEEN.

Foreign Office, September 11, 1843.

> "Oh no we never mention *her*,
> *Her* name is never heard."

DENMARK.—His Danish majesty has issued a decree, abolishing Sunday markets, and forbidding slaves to work on that day, giving them Saturday instead. To give due solemnity to this act, the governor-general had ordered the attendance of twelve negroes from every plantation, to the respective school-houses, where missionaries kept prayers, and encouraged them to thanksgivings towards God, the king, and their *masters!* This is nothing better than trifling with a great subject. What amuses us most, however, is, that as if ashamed of the name *slave*, his merciful majesty calls these wretched victims by a new name—"the *unfree*."—*British Reporter.*

SURINAM.—This Dutch colony has always been distinguished for cruelty to slaves. A gentleman writing from there recently, says:

> "An overseer (a white man, of course,) confessed in my hearing, that, during a bush patrol, he had shot dead a negress with child—a legal act here, done by command of a superior officer. You may judge what sort of things the *illegal* acts of such people must be."

BRAZIL.—HOW SLAVERY WORKS.—The *Jornal do Commercio* of July 20th, contains the trial of a slave, Camillo, for the murder of his master, Senhor Velipo Herr de Carvalho, at Rio de Janeiro. It appears from the proceedings, that the suffering of cruelty on the one hand, and the dread of further cruelty on the other, had frequently wrought Camillo up to a pitch of frenzy. Once he seized the whip when held up for the purpose of flogging him; and, when letting it go, at the furious demand of the overseer, he said in a tone of desperation, "Strike now, perhaps you may never do so again." On another occasion, terror and despair led him to stab himself, and finally the same impulse hurried him on to the murder of his master. The more particular object of his revenge in this case, was not his master, but the overseer, by whom the punishments which galled him were inflicted. He states himself to have argued thus:—"If I kill the overseer, I shall have to deal with my master; but if I kill my master, I shall only have to run." He watched his opportunity, and effected his object, although not his escape. And thus the life of a respectable person, leaving a distracted widow and family, is added to the frightful price already paid for the support of the unrighteous system of slavery.

Another Rio paper, of four days later date, mentions that a slave, of the house of Senor Valento, baker, at Nithnoly, had cut the throat of one of the shopmen, no doubt in resentment for the usual bad treatment of slaves at the hands of servants.

Congress.

SENATE, TUESDAY, March 19.

Mr. Crittenden submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy he and he hereby is requested to furnish Samuel Colt with such facilities and assistance in boats, anchors, men, &c. authorized by the resolution of Congress, approved August 31, 1842, as may be requisite to enable him to complete his preparations and submarine experiments for testing Colt's submarine battery.

Mr. Choate addressed the Senate on the Oregon question, with a beauty and power very seldom equaled in the Senate, or elsewhere.

Mr. C. vindicated himself against certain groundless imputations. He had been treated as if he would *never* give the proposed notice—as if he would have the country "sleep" upon its title. This was all unfounded. The single point in dispute was, whether the notice should be given now—instantly—not whether it should never be given The senator from Pennsylvania insisted that this resolution was brought forward, not for the purpose of obstructing a negotiation, but in order to get Oregon, because England never would yield it up to us without such a notice should be given on our part. The senator, then, meant to say, that under such a notice Great Britain would give us that which she would never give without it. Now, he wanted to know what this notice was intended to say to England? And here he must complain that, in reference to a matter of such transcendant national importance, he missed something of that accustomed clearness and lucid explicitness of statement for which the country would now so much thank the senator from Pennsylvania. True, Mr. C. knew, argumentatively, what it all meant perfectly well; but still, he had a right to complain that these, our leaders in peace, and our guides in council, even while urging upon the Senate a measure which must carry the country to the very ridge of battle, declined to tell them what the measure really was, and how it was to work. Mr. C. affirmed that the language of this notice was this: give us up the exclusive possession of this territory of Oregon, or in twelve months from this time we will take it. This certainly was its meaning, or it meant nothing. But they had to make out the meaning by argument. None of the advocates of the measure had avowed it; no one would speak out and say this was what they meant. And yet that was the meaning of their notice. That was what it meant, and that was what the senator, in substance, said it meant. It was to make England give us that which she would not give us without it. The senator said that from this notice she would learn, "that we were at last in earnest." "At last." What did the senator mean? Had he not himself declared that we had been asserting our rights on paper for these twenty-six years? Had he not said that there was a string of documents to show this, which were so numerous he would not undertake to count them? What, then, did he mean by showing by this notice that we were *at last* in earnest? It must mean that now we meant to do something more than merely assert our title, i. e. that we would take the territory by the strong hand. Yet nobody would say this. Not one of the senators would avow it.

The people were to be brought to the very gaping gulf and precipice of a general war, yet none would tell them how it was done. The senator explained his meaning; for he told the Senate that so long as England possessed and enjoyed in this territory all she wanted there, she never would give it up. This notice, then, was to be equivalent to a warning that she was not to have what she had in Oregon any longer; in other words, that in twelve months we should take the country.

Now, Mr. C. held that this mode of influencing a foreign government was a matter for the most cautious and delicate handling. It was a sort of prescription which ought to be administered in very minute doses; very minute indeed—in homœpathic doses, he believed was the term.

Mr. C. had been strongly struck with this inconsistency, while listening to the honorable senator, and those who agreed with him. While they were constantly declaring that they desired peace, that they were for peace, that all their ends were peace, and only peace, Mr. C. had been surprised to see how thickly sown was every speech with all the elements of war. They were all for peace—their ends were peace—yet their means, he could not but think, had a frightful grimness. Their ends were peace, yet they began by a threat; and it did so happen, he presumed through inadvertence, that while all their aims were peace, the very able and eloquent speeches they made in its favor, were all stuffed with whatever was calculated to blow up the blood of men of both nations to the point of boiling heat. They were all for peace; yet they would tell England that Lord Ashburton came to these shores "with a red lie in his pocket, and a white lie in his mouth." They were for peace; yet they were proclaiming that England was ever on the march to take possession, by her power, of that to which she had not a particle of just claim. They were for peace; yet they were ever reminding us that the whole British press, without a single exception, were with one voice constantly vilifying and vilipending whatever we loved. By some extraordinary lapse of the tongue, it must be presumed to have happened. These honorable senators, while assuring and re-assuring the Senate and the country that their only ends were peace, all peace, only peace—had proclaimed that our American cities all loved England too well—(a declaration calculated at once to destroy all the influence of the entire mercantile community.) They went for peace, yet they contrived to remind the President, who, as the executive power, was of course to act an important part in the formation of any treaty, that he had been insulted at a public table in New-York, where his health had been drunk in contemptuous silence, while that of Queen Victoria was welcomed with shoutings of applause. This certainly was calculated to persuade the executive to those pacific ends the senators had in view. Yes, the senators were with one mind for peace; yet they openly declared that there pervaded the entire mind of the mass of the people of these United States a deep-seated, deep-rooted, undying hatred to England, based on the remembrance of her past injuries. Really, while listening to the senators—and he listened with the highest admiration of their talents and patriotic zeal—he could not, for his life, help comparing their speeches, all alive with the breath of war, and bristling at every point with swords and bayonets, while their only purpose was to secure peace, with the commencement of that unequaled orator, who, in the Roman forum, told the thronging citizens that "he came to bury Cæsar, not to praise him;" he had no purpose to excite them against the conspirators, or to set them to burning their houses about their ears; yet who did not admire the inimitable address with which he turned, again and again, to those poor dumb wounds; the dexterity with which he used the charm of the mantle, and showed the place where "ran Cassius' dagger through," and then, "what a rent the envious Casca made," and here where "the well-beloved Brutus stabbed;" how he adverted to the will, and read the legacy, till at last the mob, doubtless to his great astonishment, broke out into sudden fury, tore up the seats of the forum, and rushed into the city with fire and sword, in pursuit of the conspirators. Antony was insincere; but these honorable senators, every one of them, were perfectly sincere. And yet, he could not but mark the contrast between the end they proposed and the topics with which they almost flew at the throats of those with whom they wanted to make a treaty. To him it seemed much as if the honorable gentlemen had said, "We want peace, but God knows poor flesh and blood can't bear everything! We want peace, certainly, by all means; but just think now of their sending Ashburton here with his *suppressio veri* and his *suggestio falsi!* We want peace, we go for peace; but how can we endure to see England go into our territory of Oregon without the least shadow of a title? We want peace; yet hear that foul and ribald British press, how it reviles us, without sparing age or station! We want peace, but hear what they say about our not paying our debts! We want peace, yet how can we forbear reminding the executive of the insult cast on his name by those New-York merchants? Yes, we all want peace—we are striving for it; but God only knows how we are to stand up against this perpetual cry for war, coming from a whole people who are possessed with a deadly hatred to England." These gentlemen loved peace, but they did not love it with a love of desire: it was more with a love of pity. The honorable senators' speeches reminded him of that dial which "spoke not, but pointed full upon the point of murder." Mr. C. too, wanted peace; but God alone knew how it could be preserved by such arguments, and such looks, and words, and tones, as they had witnessed in this debate.

The Senate had been told by the senator from Pennsylvania that the minds of the great mass of the American people were pervaded by a deep-seated, deeply-grounded sentiment of unchangeable enmity to Great Britain. The senator told us, in fact, that our veins were all filled with ill-blood—with ill-blood toward England, by the memory of her many wrongs. Mr. C. thanked the senator from Virginia, (Mr. RIVES,) and the senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CRITTENDEN,) for having set a mark upon that sentence in the speech of the honorable Senator from Pennsylvania. Exhausted as he was, and if he knew these were to he his last words, he would use them to unite his reprobation with theirs of such a sentiment.

Being by God's mercy one of the people of America himself—having been born and bred, not in one of our cities, but in the country, where all were said to be imbued with this implacable, unmitigable hatred to England—he felt himself struck at, wounded, by being involved in the accusation of laboring under a sentiment so gloomy and so barbarous toward any one of all the nations of the earth. So deeply had it impressed his mind that he had been hardly able to think of anything else, since he heard, with astonishment, such a sentence drop from the lips of an honorable senator on this floor. He would not hear an enemy of the country say this.

But let us distinguish. That intense feeling of nationality—that strong, impulsive, inbred sense of independent national existence—that conviction that we have a transcendent destiny to fulfill, and know how to fulfill it—that we have a career of glory to run, and know how to run it, till we have fixed our name on the glittering memorials of this world; that consciousness that we are encompassed by a noble group of surrounding nations, witnessing our race of honor, and whom we mean to distance in that course; the existence of this among our people, its pervading presence throughout the whole national mind, he did not deny, but admitted and approved.

Some might ridicule the sentiment, but he believed, with Edmund Burke, that the possession of grand, and noble, and swelling sentiments in the people was what a wise man would not despise. But to say that the prominent sentiment among our people—the sentiment predominant over all others—was a sentiment of unmixed implacable hatred to any one nation, and not to the rest, he must deny and vehemently controvert. He denied it, and protested against it as he now heard it here advanced for the first time.

He would remind gentlemen round him of the immortal words of Washington, that the nation which indulged a habitual fondness or a habitual aversion to another nation was in some degree a slave already. He would have Americans all free. He said NO, NO, a thousand times NO, to any such sentiment. Let the highland clansman feel it who was half blinded with peat smoke, and who cherished a deadly feud as he cherished his own life; let the Indian boast of it, and hand it down to his children, by, he knew not what emblems of alligators, and catamounts, and clubs, and tomahawks, smeared with the warm blood and brains of his victims; let Poland, cloven down by oppression, with the grinding heel of tyranny on her forehead, deliver it as a pledge and memorial to her wandering exiles; let the poor dispersed family of Israel hug it to their bosom as they feel the contempt of a hostile world; but should this American people, young as yet, and inheriting from God's hand a land teeming with every boon and bounty of his munificence, destined to a career bright, resistless, and beneficent as the course of the heavenly spheres—should America, in the dew and freshness of her national being, glorious and happy now, and certain of being far more glorious and more happy in ages to come, should she corrode her young heart and, poison its life streams by moping over the stamp act, and the tea tax, and the firing of the Leopard into the Chesapeake? God forbid! He thought we had settled all that. For what else was it that so much precious patriot blood had been spilt at Lundy-Lane, at Bridgewater, and Plattsburg, on the deck of the Constitution, and the Java, and on all the other spots hallowed by the record of our fame, but to settle all these matters of complaint? And after we had settled them, and done it boldly and bravely, should we return sulky from the very field of honor?

The senator told us that our people felt *too deeply* the remembrance of the past injuries of Britain. How so? If the feeling was worthy of us, could it be too deep or too strong in our hosom? If it was moral, ought we to regret its presence! But if it was an unworthy feeling, an immoral feeling, and had no real existence among us, how did any man dare to charge it upon the American people? Would any Senator here avow such a feeling? Would he say, in the presence of this body, that he could not help it; that there was ill-blood in his veins, and that he cherished a deep and habitual hatred against a foreign nation? And if gentlemen would not confess this in themselves, why would they confess it in the name of their country?

Mr. C. said he did believe that this was a feeling which belonged altogether to a past age. His younger countrymen—and he spoke now especially of them, and to them—his younger countrymen did not, he was very sure, know what such a feeling meant. It had been truly and philosophically said that in the feelings of the young men of any generation of mankind might be read the history of the coming age: it was wrapped up in that feeling as the embryo tree was enfolded in the seed; and he believed that could the hearts of his young brethren of this land be examined and turned out to view, no such feeling would be found there. They were born under happier auspices than to be the slaves of so sordid and dark a passion. They looked upon England as they did upon France, and on other great foreign nations, with eyes which filled with tears, not of sorrow, but of the emulation of so much glory, and with no hatred; the trophies of their glory would not let them sleep; but they regarded them with no hatred. They never could brand their heart with so barbarous a feeling for the sake of wrongs for which the brave had made the last expiation to the brave. He had now done with this. If gentlemen felt themselves bound in honor and in duty to go to war with England, why, in heaven's name, let them do it: but let them not, therefore, suppose that a diseased and cancerous condition of the heart would prevent this nation from acting according to its unbiassed convictions of the right and the true.

Mr. Buchanan said the gentleman had made a studied speech, a very studied speech. This made four speeches in answer to his own weak effort! He had never perpetrated poetry, but if he had, he would yield the palm to the senator, who surpassed to-day all the poetry he had ever uttered before.

[Mr. B. gained nothing by this very small and ill-timed attempt to disparage the admirable speech, of which we have above only given imperfect specimens. Everybody saw and *felt* that neither Mr. Choate, nor perhaps, any other man, would *prepare* such a speech. It came from the heart, and went straight to it. Every man felt, and many said that it was an eloquent, and noble vindication of the honor, the humanity, and Christianity of the country, and of every man in it.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MONDAY, March 11.

Mr. *A. V. Brown*, from the committee on territories, to whom had been referred a bill for organizing a territorial government, in *Oregon*, reported said bill with an amendment extending the jurisdiction of the territory of Iowa over Oregon. Referred to committee of the whole.

Mr. *G. Davis*, of Kentucky, offered an amendment to the Constitution, requiring each State to choose *electors* by districts. Lies over.

Mr. *Harper*, of Ohio, offered a resolution for inquiring whether it be expedient so to amend the Constitution, that the people may vote *directly* for President and Vice-President. Lies over.

Mr. E. D. Potter submitted a resolution for procuring a painting of the battle of New Orleans. Lies over.

Mr. *Black*, of Georgia, offered the following resolution, on which he demanded the previous question:

Resolved, That Congress has no constitutional power to abolish slavery in the territories of the United States, or in the District of Columbia, or to receive any petition, memorial, or other paper, the purpose of which is to accomplish that object, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. *Cave Johnson* moved that the resolution he laid on the table.

Mr. *Black* demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. *Adams* inquired of the Speaker whether the resolution did not fall within the 21st rule?

The *Speaker* decided that it did not.

The resolution to lay on the table, prevailed, yeas 96, nays 61.

Mr. *Schenk*, of Ohio, offered a resolution, calling on the President for information whether *Duff Green* had been employed by this government on business abroad, in what capacity, and with what compensation; and moved a suspension of the rules, which was refused—yeas 86, nays 75.

In pursuance of notice heretofore given, Mr. *Giddings* offered the following amendment to the (old 21st now) 25th rule of the House:

"Provided nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to prohibit the reception of any petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper seeking the repeal of any existing act of Congress."

On this amendment, Mr. G. demanded the previous question.

The House refused to second the demand for the previous question, and the resolution giving rise to debate, was laid over.

TUESDAY, March 12.

The Rhode Island memorial and *Dorrism*, were discussed by *E. R. Potter*, of R. I. Mr. P. said that the malcontents of Rhode Island had made the mistake of taking the *right* of *revolution* for a *legal right*.

The bill making appropriations for the *military academy*, was taken up, and a discussion ensued on Mr. *Hale's* amendment to abolish the academy. It was discussed in committee of the whole, on an amendment to Mr. *Hale's*, requiring that the amount expended on the academy should be expended in instructing and disciplining the militia of the several States. Mr. *Hunt*, of N. Y. and Mr. *J. R. Ingersoll*, of Pa. spoke in favor of the academy, and Mr. *Seymour*, of Ct. against it. Mr. Seymour pointed out as a peculiarity of our army, disgraceful and dangerous to a republic, that the common soldier could not hope for preferment.

[I think this point has been neglected. I do not think it was ever intended to exclude the common soldier and non-commissioned officer, from the chance of promotion, but such is the *effect* of our system. It is the same in the navy. We want educated officers, and we must have them, but the door ought to be left open for the meritorious common soldier, or sailor, to rise to the highest rank in his profession. We praise *Napoleon* for his "*carreire ouverte aux taliens*," (about all that we ought to praise him for,) and then practice, even more than the old monarchies, the very reverse.]

WEDNESDAY, March 13.

Mr. *Kennedy*, of Ia. spoke in favor of the Rhode Island memorialists, and in defense of *Dorrism*. He said that the old *Eastern* States offered no chance for a young democrat, and gave a general invitation to all free spirits to come *west*.

Mr. Dromgoole reported a bill to repeal the *distribution act*. After a pretty severe conflict between the parties, the *whigs* fighting for time to discuss, and the *democrats* for the immediate passage of the bill, it was passed to he engrossed under the previous question. Yeas 115, *all democrats*; nays 63, *all whigs*. On the question "shall this bill he passed?" Mr. Stewart, of Pa. rose and made a very animated speech during the "hour." He declared that this was a bill to destroy the tariff, which was now bringing *twenty millions of specie* into the country annually; and to let in an addition of *fifty millions*' worth of British goods to drain the country of its specie, and break down our manufactures. He stated that the balance of trade with Great Britain during the last year, (under the present tariff,) was $13,000,000 in our favor, which had come in specie. Mr. *Hopkins*, of Va. replied, by saying that he should not reply, but simply remind the House how a certain gentleman in the other wing of the capitol, had called the democrats "condemned criminals;" and how the party of which that gentleman was the head, had passed measures under all sorts of gags. He called the previous question, and the bill was passed—yeas 113, nays 61.

Mr. *Dromgoole*, reported the *sub-treasury bill*, and moved to refer it to committee of the whole, and print. Mr. *M. Brown* moved to lay it on the table, yeas 62, nays 100. It was then referred.

ABOLITIONISTS, PAY YOUR DEBTS!

The Executive Committee of the American Society have adopted the ONE DOLLAR PLAN, for the special purpose of paying the debt, for which partial provision only was made at the late annual meeting.

The question is now to be answered—*Does the American Anti-Slavery Society number twenty-five hundred members, who are able to pay One Dollar each, for the payment of its debt?* If so, we shall soon be an honest society. If not, we shall soon cease to be a society at all. Our operations cannot be continued, if we cannot go upon the cash system.

Friends of the Society are requested to act as agents in their respective localities, and to collect without delay, as much as they can, and remit to the Treasurer.

PAYMENT RECEIVED.

Amount previously acknowledged,	$422
423 Dea. W. Farwell, Cambridgeport, Mass.	1

TREASURER'S RECEIPTS

For the week ending 3d mo. (March) 30th, 1844.

Received for the Standard—The following persons have each paid $2: Stephen Kester, New Carlile, Ohio; Rebecca J. Waddle, South Charleston, Ohio; McNear & Steele, Clinton, N. Y.; John T. Freeman, Cornish, N. H.; Wm. Thayer, Rockingham, Vt.; S. Philbrick, Boston William N. Andrews, Dover, N. H.; Asa D. Wright, Hamburgh, N. Y.; Mary Wilbur, Commons, R. I.; G. J. Slocomb, Scipio, N. Y.; Gideon Bloxsome, Cortsville, Ohio.—Total, $22.

C. A. Brown, East Abington, Mass. $3; Edward Rodman, Lynn, Mass. $3; Joseph H. Studly, Hanover, Massachusetts, $1.—Total, $7.

ISAAC T. HOPPER, *Treasurer.*

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

General Items.

Dreadful Accident.—In the township of Yonge, Mr. George Ross, hearing an unusual noise among the dogs, after the family were in bed, got up to ascertain the cause. In taking down an over-coat in the dark, he pulled down a gun or fusil, which had been loaded with buck shot. In the fall, the butt end struck the floor, and the muzzle the bedstead, when it instantly went off, the contents entering the left side of Mrs. Ross, and passing out under the right breast, the child being asleep on the mother's right arm, with its head resting on the breast, the shot entered his neck and head; both expired before a light could be got.—*Brockville (Canada) Recorder.*

Runaway Negroes.—We learn from the Hanesville, (Miss.) Free Press, that part of a gang of runaway negroes have been caught. It appears that several farmers armed and stationed themselves in the vicinity of the place, determined to secure alive, if possible, the whole gang. They had not been waiting long in ambush before six negroes made their expected appearance, when the company from the country bade them surrender. The negroes immediately presented two guns in the face of the foremost of the party, Jeremiah King and Charles King, but before they could execute their murderous designs, these gentlemen fired upon and shot them down, one of whom attempted to discharge his piece at J. King while he lay wounded. Three of the gang made their escape during the skirmish, while the remaining one brandished a large knife, about a foot in length, with the most savage defiance. A blow from the barrel of the empty gun of J. King, dextrously dealt, soon laid him prostrate beside his fallen companions!

One of the negroes shot died, the other is expected to live but a short time.

Ferocious Prejudice.—Last week a large crowd of persons assembled for the purpose of inflicting their displeasure on a colored man named Locke, keeping a recess on the canal packet wharf, the first in the Exchange buildings, who had on the day before married a white girl. He escaped—they hotly pursued, and the sovereign people wreaked their vengeance on the contents of his shop, its windows, &c.—*Utica Gazette.*

The Slave Trade.—The captain and first lieutenant of a British brig of war, were recently stabbed by some slave dealers, in Rio de Janeiro, for no other cause save their activity in capturing slavers on the coast of Africa. The authorities or police officers were in pursuit of the assassins, but no capture had been made.

TEXAS presents, from the best and most authentic geographical information, a superficial area of 350,000 square miles—that is, it is five times as large as the commonwealth of Virginia, more than twice as large as the kingdom of France, and ten times as large as England and Wales.

Annexation of Texas.—Resolutions in opposition to the annexation of Texas were defeated in the House of Representatives of the Pennsylvania legislature, by a vote of 45 to 43.

NOTICES.

TENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

This meeting will commence its sessions at 4 o'clock P. M. on Tuesday the 7th day of May, at Concert Hall No. 406 Broadway.

THE ANNIVERSARY MEETING.

Will be held at the Apollo Hall, No. 410 Broadway, on the same day—services to commence at 10 o'clock, A. M.

The members of the society, and the friends of the oppressed generally, are invited to attend, and to participate in the deliberations of the occasion. Many questions of great moment to the welfare of the country, and to the cause of freedom, will come up for discussion and disposal. It is desirable to secure a large representation from all parts of the country, and to avail ourselves of every means to forward the object of the society.

A record book for the names of persons who attend, will be open at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 143 Nassau street—where, also, cards of reference to boarding-houses can be obtained.

On behalf of the Society,

WM. P. POWELL, } *Com. of Ar-*
J. S. GIBBONS, } *rangement.*

Anti-Slavery and friendly papers will please copy.

THE ELEVENTH MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

This annual effort for the sustentation of the anti-slavery cause, will be made in Amory Hall, Boston, commencing on Tuesday, December 24th, 1844. By its means it is, that the debts of the cause, last year, were discharged; so that it is, at this moment, free to put its unencumbered strength, in the prosecution of THE HUNDRED CONVENTIONS, through the medium of which, this appeal reaches you. If you wish slavery to cease, you cannot more effectually aid in its extinction, than by upholding this Fair. The experience of ten years enables the women of Massachusetts to present it to you as an effectual channel, through which your sympathy may unite with that of others, to swell the flood of effort by which high principle shall be diffused, and right feeling excited, till the horrible institution of slavery shall be swept away.

None of the funds raised by means of this Fair are ever permitted to run to waste in building up a political party, or in defraying electioneering expenses. They are used to promulgate, through the press, and by the living voice, the truths of freedom, which convert men's hearts to the cause. We give a guaranty for the economical and judicious disposal of them, by providing for their expenditure by the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. Without going back for years, to recapitulate former help, the beneficial consequences of which are in perpetual glow, we will simply state that the proceeds of this last year's Fair were TWENTY-ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS, exclusive of many small appropriations, and the necessary expenses; and that, [illegible] this aid, neither the Hundred Western C[illegible] the Hundred Conventions now in progress [illegible] sachusetts would have been undertaken. The [illegible] of the cause might be increased ten-fold, by m[illegible] that aid from the commonwealth generally, which [illegible] disposed, if the way were open, to afford. A few w[illegible] of suggestion may open this way. Permit us to ma[illegible] them for the cause's sake.

First. We entreat whomsoever this sheet reaches, instantly to announce an intention of aiding the ELEVENTH MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR, and to form, if possible, a little circle for weekly anti-slavery effort through the year. Gain all the aid possible, but *wait for no one else*. Whoever begins will be the nucleus round which much help will gather at length.

Second. To remember that there is nothing useful or ornamental—no mechanical, agricultural, or manufacturing product—nothing either to eat, drink, or wear—no work of taste or art, for household use or decoration—but will (so perfect have our arrangements at length become) be made as available to the cause as its worth in money.

Third. To correspond with us for the purpose of benefiting us by your suggestions, and receiving the aid of ours. For it may often be in the power of all the friends of the cause, mutually to aid each other by the interchange of materials and labor, and by furnishing the newest patterns of articles of dress, or models of articles of furniture.

There surely needs no searching argument or eloquent appeal to commend the cause of freedom and humanity to professed republicans and Christians. All see and feel that it is a good and noble thing to spring to the relief and rescue of one human being undergoing wrong, or peril, or suffering. But here are will-nigh THREE MILLIONS, undergoing all the suffering, wrong, and peril of SLAVERY, that incarnation of all that is dreadful to the sons and daughters of Massachusetts, while all that universal man holds dear and holy is endangered by the existence of such a blighting institution. Righteous principle dies out—good feeling is extinguished—our country is endangered—our character as a people dishonored; and will not you, who admire a single act of devotedness, though done but for a single human being, be true to your own moral nature, and gladly give time, labor, money, prayer, sacrifice, that so you may save a nation—redeem a race—ennoble an age?

Let us hear from you speedily, and consider us your servants for the cause's sake,

M. W. Chapman, *Ann T. G. Phillips,*

THE HUNDRED CONVENTIONS IN MASSACHUSETTS.

☞ All the conventions which last two days, will begin at 1 o'clock, P. M. of the day first named. Where only one day is named, they will commence at 10 A. M.

After which, the same eloquent advocates of the slave's cause will make a tour through Bristol, and then through Essex county.

Conventions in *Middlesex* and *Norfolk*, will be attended by Parker Pillsbury, Frederic Douglas, and Wm. A. White; and will take place as follows:

Northern Series.

Fitchburg—Wednesday and Thursday, 3d and 4th.
Leominster—Friday and Saturday, 5th and 6th.
Ashburnham—Monday and Tuesday, 8th and 9th.
Gardner—Wednesday and Thursday, 10th and 11th.
Hubbardston—Friday and Saturday, 12th and 13th.
Petersham—Monday and Tuesday, 15th and 16th.
Athol—Wednesday and Thursday, 17th and 18th.

☞ The friends of the cause, in the above named towns and their immediate vicinity, are urgently requested to take every means of giving the widest possible notice of these meetings. Let *each* one consider this *his own personal* duty. See to it, also, that convenient places for assembling are obtained, so as to secure large audiences. Let all that can, be present, especially those who are willing to take a part in the discussions; and thus, while they relieve the agents, give added interest to the debate. We mean to awaken the old, and create a new anti-slavery zeal throughout the commonwealth. The most important questions are to be discussed by the ablest and most devoted of the friends of the slave. We commend them to the hospitality of the friends everywhere, and hope that especially they will be aided in getting from place to place, to lessen the labor and expense of the whole undertaking. Any town which does not receive large printed placards to notify the meetings of the convention during its session, can be supplied by applying at 25 Cornhill.

WENDELL PHILLIPS,
Gen. Agent Mass. A. S. Society.

PHILADELPHIA FEMALE A. S. SOCIETY.

A stated meeting of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, will be held at Clarkson Hall, on Thursday evening, April 11th, at half-past seven o'clock.

PHEBE EARLE, *Secretary.*

NEW-YORK WHOLESALE PRICES CURRENT.

CORRECTED WEEKLY FOR THE STANDARD.

ASHES.	
Pot, first sort	4.50 a 4.56¼
Pearl	5.00 a 5.06¼
CANDLES.	
Mould, tallow lb.	9 a 12
Sperm	29 a 32
Stearic do.	20 a 25
COAL.	
Liverpool, chaldron,	7.00 a 8.25
Newcastle	6.00 a 6.75
Scotch	6.00 a .
Sidney Pictou	6.00 a 6.25
Anthracite, 2,000lbs.	5.75 a 5.50
COFFEE.	
Java	9⅞ a 11
Sumatra	7 a 7½
Porto Rico	7¾ a 8¼
Laguayra	7 a 8
Cuba	6½ a 7½
Brazil	6⅞ a 7¾
St. Domingo	5 a 5½
COTTON.	
New Orleans	7 a 11
Alabama	7½ a 11
Florida	7½ a 9
Upland	8¾ a 9
Upland, fair	8¾ a 9
Upland, good and fine	9¼ a 9½
DOMESTICS.	
Shirtings, brown 3-4	4½ a 6
do. do. 7-8	6 a 7
do. bleached.	5 a 8
do. S. I. do.	7 a 11
Sheetings, brown 4-4	7 a 9
do. do. 5-4	10 a 12½
do. bleached 4-4	7 a 12
do. do. 5-4	12 a 15
Calicoes, blue	7 a 12
do. fancy	6 a 8
Plaids	9 a 11
Stripes, fast colors	8 a 10
Satinetts	35 a 70
Checks 4-4	8 a 12
Cotton yarn, 5 a 13	14 a 16
do. 14 a 19	— a 17
do. 20 a 23	— a —
DRUGS & DYES.	
Alum, lb.	3 a
Cochineal	1.10 a 1.15
Copperas	1½ a 1¾
Gum Myrrh	15 a 40
do. copal washed	35 a 42
do. Arabic	22 a 38
Madder, Dutch	12½ a 20
Oil of Anis	2.00 a .
castor, gall.	90 a 1.00
Tartaric acid, lb.	38 a 40
Verdigris	23 a 23½
Vitriol, blue	8 a 8½
DYEWOODS.	
Brazilletto, ton	25.00 a 27.50
Camwood	50.00 a 60.00
Fustic, Cuba	28.00 a 26.00
do. Tampico	16.00 a 18.00
Logwood, Cpy.	26.00 a 28.00
FEATHERS.	
Live, foreign lb.	13 a 24½
do. American	26 a 29
FISH.	
Dry cod, cwt.	2.75 a 2.81¼
Dry scale	1.25 a 1.50
Pickled, bbl.	4.00 a 4.25
do. salmon, tce	16.00 a 17.00
Smoked do. lb.	.9 a .10
Mackeral, 1, bbl.	10.75 a 11.00
do. No. 2	8.75 a 9.00
do. No. 3	6.87½ a 7.00
Shad, Ct. hf. bbl.	5.50 a 6.50
Bucksp't. bbl.	6.00 a 7.00
Mass. do.	12.50 a 13.00
Herring, pickled	3.00 a 3.50
do. scale box,	50 a .60
do. No. 1	30 a .
do. No. 2	20 a .
FLAX.	
Russia, lb.	8 a 11
American	8 a 8½
FLOUR & MEAL.	
Genesee per bbl.	4.93¾ a .
Troy	a .
Ohio, via canal	4.87½ a 4.98¾
Michigan	4.87½ a 4.98¾
Philadelphia	4.87½ a 5.00
Baltimore	5.00 a
Richmond c. mills	5.62½ a 6.00
do. country	5.00 a .
Brandywine	5.00 a .
Georgetown	4.87½ a 5.00
Alexandria	4.87½ a 5.00
Fredericksburg	4.87½ a .
Petersburg	500. a 5.12½
Rye flour	3.50 a 3.62½
Indian meal	2.50 a 2.62½
do. per hhd.	12.00 a 12.25
GRAIN.	
Wheat, Ohio bush.	1.02 a 1.06
do. Genesee	1.00 a 1.05
do. Southern new	90 a 1.00
Rye northern	65 a .68
Corn north'n & Jersey	48 a .49
Southern	44 a .50
Barley, N.R.	54 a .
Oats, northern	32 a .34
do. southern	28 a .29
do. New-Jersey	
Beans, tce.	6.12 a 7.62½
Peas do.	6.12 a 7.25
HEMP.	
Russia, ton	180.00 a 185.00
Manilla	145.50 a 150.00
American, dew rot	100.00 a 115.00
do. water rot	120.00 a 130.00
HIDES.	
B. A. & Rio Grande, lb.	13 a 18½
California	4 a 11
Orinoco	12 a 12½
Mexican	11 a 12
S. American horse, piece	a
Calcutta, dry	60 a .85
HOPS.	
First sort 1843, lb.	7 a 8
HORNS.	
Ox, hundred	7.00 a 8.00
Cow	1.00 a 2.00
IRON.	
Pig, Eng. & Sc. ton	30.00 a 32.50
do. American	20.00 a 25.50
Bar do. rolled	75.00 a 77.50
do. Russia P,S,L,	a 105.00
do. do. new do.	75.00 a .
do. Swedes	. a 75.00
do. Eng. com.	. a 57.50
do. do. refined	75. a 75.50
Sheet E. & Am. lb.	5¼ a 5¾
Hoop do. do. cwt.	5.00 a 5.50
LEAD.	
Pig, 100 lbs.	3.27½ a 3.40
Bar, lb.	4 a 4¼
Sheet	4½ a
LEATHER.	
Oak lb. (sole,)	19 a 24
Hemlock, light	16½ a 17
do. middle	16 a 16½
do. heavy	13½ a 14½
do. damaged	12¾ a 13½
LUMBER.	
Boards, N. R. M. ft.	30.00 a 35.00
do. east pine	. a 10.00
do. Albany, piece	7 a .17
Plank Ga. pine, M. ft.	20.00 a 24.00
Scautling pine	14.00 a 15.00
do. oak	30.00 a 35.00
Timber oak, cu. ft.	.25 a .37
do. Ga. yel. pine	.35 a .40
Shingles, cy. M.	11.00 a 14.00
Staves w. o. pipe M.	50.00 a 53.00
do. do. hhd.	34.00 a 35.00
do. do. bbl.	28.00 a 30.00
do. r oak hhd.	26.00 a .
Heading, w. o.	40.00 a 45.00
Hoops	25.00 a 30.00
MOLASSES.	
New-Orleans, gall.	30 a 31
Porto Rico	29 a 31
St. Croix	24 a 26½
Trinidad, Cuba	27 a 30
Martinique & Guadaloupe	a
Havana & Matanzas	23 a 24
Neuvitas	28 a 32
NAILS.	
Cut, 4d a 40d	4 a 4½
(3d 1 cent and 2d 2 cents more.)	
Wrought, 6d a 20d	10 a 12½
Horseshoe, No. 7 a 9	18 a 20
NAVAL STORES.	
Tar, bbl.	1.25 a 1.50
Pitch	1.12½ a 1.25
Rosin	.60 a .85
Turp. Wil'ton soft	2.25 a 2.50
do. N. C. soft	2.25 a 2.62½
Spirits turp'tine gal.	32 a 34
OILS.	
Olive, gall.	90 a 95
Linseed, American	87 a
Whale refined	50 a 58
Sperm, fall	80 a 90
do. winter	a 95
Lard oil	63 a 65
PROVISIONS.	
Beef mess bbl.	5.87½ a 6.25
do. prime	3.87½ a 4.25
Butter, prime dairy	16 a 18
do. ord. to good	8 a 12
do. common	6 a
Hog's lard	6 a 7½
Pork, mess bbl.	9.00 a 9.12
do. prime	7.00 a 7.75
do. cargo	a
Cheese, Am. lb.	5 a 7
Hams smoked	7 a 9
RICE.	
100 lbs.	2.48 a 3.00
SALT.	
Turkish Isl. bushel	28 a 32
Bonaire	30 a 34
Curacoa	25 a 26
Ivica	
Cadiz	a
St. Kitts	a
Lisbon	a
Liverpool, ground	a
do. do. sack	1.17 a 1.20
do. do. fine	1.42½ a 1.52½
SOAP.	
New-York, brown lb.	5 a 7
Castile	9 a 9½
STEEL.	
German lb.	10½ a 13
English, hoop L.	13 a 13½
Trieste, in boxes	6½ a 7
American	5 a
Spring	5½ a 6
SUGARS.	
St. Croix, lb.	8 a 8½
New-Orleans	6½ a 7¾
Cuba, Muscovado	6¼ a 7¼
Porto Rico	6¼ a 8½
Havana, white	8¾ a 9
do. brown	6¾ a 7¾
Cuba, white	9 a 10
do. brown	6½ a 8
Brazil, white	a
do brown	a
Manilla, brown	6⅜ a 6¼
Lump	
Loaf	11 a 12
TALLOW.	
Foreign, lb.	
American	6¾ a 7¼
TEAS.	
Imperial, lb.	31 a 75
Gunpowder	31 a 75
Hyson	30 a 75
Young Hyson	30 a 70
Hyson skin	20 a 30
Souchong	22 a 50
Bohea	a
TIN.	
Block, South Am. lb.	a
do. East India	14 a 16
In plates ½ ⋈ box	8.00 a 8.25
WOOL.	
Am. Sax'y. fleece, lb.	42 a 45
do. merino	40 a 42
Pulled, superfine	35 a 36
No. 1	30 a 31
No. 2	24 a 25

Poetry.

THE LITTLE BLIND BOY.

We find the following admirable lines, in the Baltimore Saturday Visitor. Is it not a cheering sign that things like this are beginning to be printed in slaveholding States? The editor says: "The following poem, for which we are indebted to an unknown correspondent, is one of the most powerful, for its length, that we have ever seen. The text, as it was given by our correspondent, is to the effect that a blind colored boy in Virginia, was sold away from his mother, for the paltry sum of one dollar, and she subsequently taken to Missouri":

Come back to me, mother! Why linger away
From thy poor little blind boy, the long weary day!
I mark every footstep, I list to each tone,
And wonder my mother should leave me alone!
There are voices of sorrow and voices of glee,
But there's no one to joy or to sorrow with me;
For each hath of pleasure and trouble his share,
And none for the poor little blind boy will care!
My mother, come back to me! Close to thy breast
Once more let thy poor little blind one be pressed;
Once more let me feel thy warm breath on my cheek,
And hear thee in accents of tenderness speak!
O mother! I've no one to love me—no heart
Can bear like thine own in my sorrows a part;
No hand is so gentle, no voice is so kind,
Oh! none like a mother can cherish the blind!
Come back to *me, mother!* Why linger away
From thy poor little blind boy, the long weary day?
I mark every footstep, I list to each tone,
And wonder my mother has left me alone!
Poor blind one! No mother thy wailing can hear,
No mother can hasten to banish thy fear;
For the slave-owner drives her o'er mountain and wild,
And for one paltry dollar, hath sold thee, poor child!
Ah, who can in language of mortals reveal
The anguish that none but a mother can feel,
When man in his vile lust of mammon hath trod
On her child, who is stricken and smitten of God!
Blind, helpless, forsaken, with strangers alone,
She hears in her anguish his piteous moan;
As he eagerly listens—but listens in vain,
To catch the lov'd tones of his mother again!
The curse of the broken in spirit shall fall
On the wretch who hath mingled this wormwood and
gall,
And his gain like a mildew shall blight and destroy,
Who hath torn from his mother the little blind boy!

◆

From Hood's Magazine.

THE LADY'S DREAM.

The lady laid in her bed,
Her couch so warm and soft,
But her sleep was restless and broken still;
For turning often and oft
From side to side, she muttered and moaned,
And toss'd her arms aloft.

At last she started up,
And gazed on the vacant air,
With a look of awe, as if she saw
Some dreadful phantom there—
And then in the pillow she buried her face
From visions ill to bear.

The very curtain shook,
Her terror was so extreme,
And the light that fell on the broider'd quilt
Kept a tremulous gleam;
And her voice was hollow, and shook as she cried:
"Oh me! that awful dream!

"That weary, weary walk,
In the churchyard's dismal ground!
And those horrible things, with shady wings,
That came and flitted round,—
Death, death, and nothing but death,
In every sight and sound!

"And oh! those maidens young,
Who wrought in that dreary room,
With figures drooping and spectres thin,
And cheeks without a bloom;—
And the voice that cried, 'For the pomp of pride,
We haste to an early tomb!

"'For the pomp and pleasure of pride,
We toil like Afric slaves,
And only to earn a home at last,
Where yonder cypress waves;—'
And then he pointed—I never saw
A ground so full of graves!

"And still the coffins came,
With their sorrowful trains and slow;
Coffin after coffin still,
A sad and sickening show;
From grief exempt, I never had dreamt
Of such a world of wo!

"Of the hearts that daily break,
Of the tears that hourly fall,
Of the many, many troubles of life
That grieve this earthly ball—
Disease, and hunger, pain, and want;
But now I dreamt of them all!

"For the blind and the cripple were there,
And the babe that pined for bread,
And the houseless man, and the widow poor,
Who begged—to bury the dead;
The naked, alas, that I might have clad,
The famished I might have fed!

"The sorrow I might have soothed,
And the unregarded tears;
For many a thronging shape was there,
From long-forgotten years;
Aye, even the poor rejected Moor,
Who raised my childish fears!

"Each pleading look, that long ago
I scanned with a heedless eye;
Each face was gazing as plainly there,
As when I passed it by;
Wo, wo, for me, if the past should be
Thus present when I die!

"No need of sulphurous lake,
No need of fiery coal,
But only that crowd of human kind,
Who wanted pity and dole—
In everlasting retrospect—
Will wring my sinful soul!

"Alas! I have walked through life
Too heedless where I trod;
Nay, helping to trample my fellow worm,
And fill the burial sod—
Forgetting that even the sparrow falls
Not unmarked of God!

"I drank the richest draughts;
And ate whatever is good—
Fish, and flesh, and fowl, and fruit,
Supplied my hungry mood;
But I never remembered the wretched ones,
That starve for want of food!

"I dressed as the noble dress,
In cloth of silver and gold,
With silk, and satin, and costly furs,
In many an ample fold;
But I never remembered the naked limbs,
That froze with winter's cold.

"The wounds I might have healed!
The human sorrow and smart!
And yet it was never in my soul
To play so ill a part;
But evil is wrought by want of thought,
As well as by want of heart!"

She clasped her fervent hands,
And the tears began to stream;
Large, and bitter, and fast they fell,
Remorse was so extreme;
And yet, oh yet, that many a dame
Would dream the Lady's Dream!

Miscellany.

THE RICH MAN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, BY ELIHU BURRITT.

One winter's evening, as Mr. O—— was sitting by his fireside with his children, Allwin and Theodore, a black-sealed letter was brought him, which he read with visible emotion. After he had perused it over and over again, he slowly folded it up, and holding it long between his hands, looked pensively into the fire. Finally he broke his long silence with these words:

"Do you still remember the splendid mansion in the vicinity of Hamburgh, which we saw in our journey a few years ago, and which contained so much that excited your admiration?"

"You mean the fairy castle," said Allwin, "that stands on the beautiful plain by the river, and which makes such a splendid impression, even at a distance. O, what a costly building! all its walls were decorated with the most beautiful paintings, and all the stairs and saloons with statues!"

"O, I can still see the room," interrupted Theodore, "where the most beautiful flowers, butterflies, and paradise-birds, were painted on light-blue silken tapestry, as if they were living; and the cabinet of natural history, where we saw so many foreign animals."

"But the most beautiful," said Allwin, "was the park, which appeared to us like an unlimited landscape, and reminded us of all that we had heard of fairy-gardens. The marble temples, the foaming water-falls, the still, cool grottos—all these stand even now before my eyes; and I remember very distinctly, how we were surprised at every step, by something new and beautiful."

"It was the very place," added Theodore, "where the gold and silver pheasants frightened us, which were flying so swiftly. What a multitude of rare birds was to be seen there! and how we wished that we were able to enjoy all those things forever!"

"You called the possessor of those things very happy," said the father; "and I reminded you, if I mistake not, that much more was to be wished, in order to enable one to enjoy such a possession."

"You said," interrupted Theodore, "that a sick man would be rather indifferent to all these good things; and a person who had a disquieted conscience, could not enjoy them at all."

"One must also have friends that would share with us in our happiness," added Allwin.

"It is true, my children!" continued the father; "and the history of the man, to whom that splendid mansion belonged, but too truly proves the justness of the observation. It has been but a few days since this unhappy man died, and this letter gives me the intelligence that his long and ardent wish to leave the world, has at last been granted."

The children desired to know whence the unhappiness of the rich man proceeded. Their father gratified their wish, by the following narrative:

"Adams, for that was the name of the wealthy and wretched man, was the son of a small trader in Lower Saxony, who died very early in life, leaving behind him this son and one only daughter, in very indigent circumstances. A distant relation of the deceased, taking an interest in the boy, carried him to Hamburgh, and apprenticed him to a merchant in that city. The daughter was under the necessity of seeking service. Adams was a young man of excellent abilities. He exerted himself to please his master, and conducted his business with great attentiveness and fidelity; acquiring, at the same time, much entertaining and useful knowledge. Nor did this zeal go unrewarded. His master soon distinguished him above his other servants, entrusted him with the most important business, and saw it prosper in his hands.

Several enterprises, which he had ventured upon Adams's advice, succeeded beyond all his expectations, increasing his respectability and connections, and soon bringing him into the possession of a fortune, which augmented daily by his prudent management. As a tribute of gratitude, he raised his young servant to a partner in his business.

Adams enjoyed his good fortune without arrogance. He conducted his business with facility, and as it afforded him many opportunities for traveling, he improved them as a means of enriching his knowledge and cultivating his taste. His horizon began to expand from day to day; his character acquired firmness, and his intercourse with men of different kinds, taught him shrewdness and dexterity; so that it was no wonder, that, wherever he went, he met with respect and esteem. The rich sought his company because he was amiable, the poor, his advice, and often his assistance; and everywhere was he ready to give his best counsel, and afford relief to the extent of his ability. You cannot easily suppose, that with such feelings, he forgot his poor and only sister. He raised her from servitude and indigence, and she married an excellent curate, who loved her, and was placed in a very convenient situation by the assistance of Adams.

After the lapse of some years, his former master was taken sick, and having lost all hope of recovery, even before his physicians had given him up, he called his partner to his bedside, and addressed him with these words: "I have not long to live, and it is time to set my house in order. I shall this day deposit my last will, in which I have appointed you to be my only heir. You deserve this, for you have managed my property with care and fidelity, and increased it ten-fold. It will prosper in your hands; and I feel no apprehension of seeing the hard earnings of my life, foolishly squandered away after my death. My sisters's children have not deported themselves agreeably to my wishes, and I am convinced that they are congratulating themselves on the prospect of my death."

All these circumstances I learned mostly from Adams himself. I had formerly transacted some business with him, and a few years ago I paid him a visit. It was then that he opened to me his whole heart. When he came to speak on this point, he exclaimed, "O, unfortunate man that I was! I thought I had attained to the summit of earthly happiness at this disclosure; I did not anticipate that fate had laid for me a dangerous snare. Urgent affairs," he continued, "compelled me, immediately after this scene, to make a short journey, which I hoped to have completed early enough, to have seen my friend still alive. Heaven had otherwise decreed. My affairs were unexpectedly protracted; he died during my absence, and it was only a few months after his death, that I returned to take possession of my inheritance.

"The nearest relations of my deceased friend, were a nephew and a niece, who, I knew not whereby, had incurred his displeasure. Their conduct had not been the most regular, and they had contracted many heavy debts upon the strength of their expectation of inheriting their uncle's fortune. On the first intelligence of the death of their wealthy relative, they had hastened with eagerness to have the will opened. Its unexpected contents filled them with consternation; they had broken out into the most vehement execrations against me; they had made many attempts to break up the will; but it was all in vain. Thus deceived in all their expectations, pursued by their creditors, they saw themselves compelled to resort to flight. It was reported that they had gone to England."

Adams now took possession of his immeasurable fortune, which increased daily by successful application. A beautiful and amiable wife heightened his happiness, which was still increased two years afterwards, by a son and daughter which she bore him. It was then that he built the beautiful and elegant house which filled you with so much admiration. He had seen much in his travels, and possessed an extensive acquaintance with artists and connoisseurs. He now made use of these advantages, and you have seen yourselves what a number of the most beautiful decorations he had collected. The happiest days of his life were spent in that delightful retreat, in the bosom of his family, and a pleasant circle of intelligent friends, whom his wealth and the agreeableness of his house, gathered around him. Adams depicted to me the happiness he then enjoyed in the liveliest colors. "All my wishes were fulfilled," said he; "or rather, my happiness surpassed all that I had ever permitted myself to dream of. As I sat before my house, by the side of my beautiful and amiable wife, and balanced my children on my knees, I fancied a paradise was lying at my feet, over which I presided alone. But the happy lot that had fallen to me from heaven, had turned away my eyes from its source. I had forgotten the mutability of all human felicity. Alas! it was only when the noblest and best part of what I called mine was lost, that I again thought on God, and my stricken heart looked up to Him whom I had forgotten in my joy. "You witness my sufferings," he added, "yet all that you can see, is a small part of my anguish."

When Adams was giving me this relation, he was lying in a small room of his country-seat, into which no ray of the sun penetrated; and on a bed, whose curtains were seldom opened. An incurable gout had seized upon all his limbs, and attacked his eyes with such violence, that the weakest glimmering of light was intolerable to him. The least movement caused him the most excruciating pains. He seldom received a visit from any one, for his widowed sister was the only person whose presence he could bear in his room, and who, therefore, administered to all his wants. His house was desolate, and where one was once accustomed to hear the voice of joy, the sighs of an incurable patient now fell upon the ear.

Adams had just then a few tolerable moments. When he saw that I was affected by his situation, he squeezed my hand, and said: "I will open to you my whole heart. You sympathize with me in my unfortunate situation, and I feel relieved when I can deposit my grief in a participating bosom." He continued, after a short pause: "I had lived six years in the most happy situation, when my affairs called me to London, where I was obliged to remain for several months. It was the first time that I had been so long absent from my family. My longing to return to my wife and children was so intense, that I enjoyed little of the pleasures of that immense city. My heart was filled with anguish by the presentiment of an approaching calamity, which was constantly torturing my mind. One day I passed by a place, where they had just made preparations for the execution of some highway robbers. I felt not the least desire to witness this spectacle; but as I heard accidentally among the crowd, that one of them was a German, I made yet further inquiries. Imagine to yourself my consternation, when I heard the name of Oliver, the man whom my former master had disinherited through his love for me. I indulged the hope for a moment that he might be some one else; but when I cast my eyes upon the scaffold, the very man was ascending the ladder, in whose haggard countenance I discovered, in a moment, the well-known features of the disinherited. I was paralyzed as if by a thunderbolt, at this terrible discovery. I hastened home without knowing what I did, or what had happened to me. And scarcely had I recovered from my first dismay, when I received a letter from my wife, informing me, that our daughter was lying sick with the scarlet fever, and that the symptoms of the same disease had become visible on my boy. She begged me to be composed, and to hope for the best.

This intelligence would have frightened me under any circumstances: but at this moment it completely prostrated me. It appeared to me instantly that my children were already beyond hope, and I brought, I know not how, their danger, and the unhappy fate of Oliver into sad connection. What I had not yet dared to think possible, stood at this dreadful moment clearly before my soul. "Thou art the cause," said I to myself, "of Oliver's crime and death. Thou hast taken possession of the property which belonged to him, because thou didst not interpose a word in his behalf, nor endeavor to reconcile his uncle to him. Now, while this unfortunate man, driven by despair from his father-land, suffers the penalty of a crime, to which his helplessness forced him, thou sufferest, in the anxiety for your children, a double death, and dost penance for the indifference with which thou hast viewed the misfortune of the disinherited. I had now no easy moment in England. I was obliged to return; and fortunately a vessel was found just ready to sail, and the image of my children already stood before my eyes. But alas! I was to see them no more! Whilst I was driving about upon the sea, death had already made a prey of the darlings of my heart. I had hardly disembarked, when I hastened eagerly to my country house. It was night before I arrived, and I saw from afar, a part of the house strongly lighted up; in the dark rooms lights were occasionally moving to and fro. My uneasiness became indescribable, and, although I was driving at the utmost speed, yet the carriage seemed to stand still. At length we arrived; I hastened up the steps. No one met me. I dashed open the illumined saloon, and beheld my wife in her coffin." Adams paused at these words, folded his hands, and appeared lost in the remembrance of his grief. After a while, he continued: "I will not attempt to describe to you my feelings. My grief was unlimited. I had fallen down upon the coffin where my beloved wife lay smiling. A violent fever attacked me; I was delirious for several days, and the physicians gave me up. But alas! I had not yet emptied the chalice of my sufferings; I recovered, contrary to all expectation. From that time, my house, which, before had been the dwelling-place of joy and contentment, seemed to me an open grave, which had swallowed up my beloved ones. Wherever I walked, wherever I directed my eyes, I saw nought else but the traces of departed joys, for which I wasted my sighs and tears in vain. But even the enjoyment of a pensive, melancholy grief, was not granted me; for the appalling image of Oliver continually crowded itself in between the dear shadows of my children, and my beloved wife. I saw him waking and sleeping. How often have I started up in mortal anxiety from my bed, as I saw him, in my dream, strangling my little ones, or throwing them into the flames of my house; or struggling with me, and demanding my possessions, which he called his legitimate property. These dreams seemed to me always the voice of conscience. The dearest of all that I called mine, were no more, and what still remained to me, gave me no pleasure. I looked upon this circumstance as a proof, that I had come into possession of it unjustly." "Alas! my friend," continued Adams, "I should have been happy if conscience had acquitted me on this point. True, I could not reproach myself for having acquired the will of my friend in an illegitimate manner; but yet, had I done the least to mitigate the severe resolution by which he disinherited his nearest relations? This omission now tormented me, and the deeds, and death of Oliver, I attributed to myself. It was wholly in vain that I struggled against this thought; it would always return; and if I had driven it from my mind during the day, at night it came back upon me with redoubled force.

Once, as I was turning myself disquietly on my bed, the thought suddenly occurred to me, which had hitherto escaped my mind, that Oliver had a sister, and that she also had shared his flight. This thought brought a weak ray of consolation into my soul. God be praised! I exclaimed, perhaps I can yet repair a part of my wrongs. I will save her, wherever she may be.

With these words I sprang up, and made preparations instantly for my departure. No one guessed my intention, for I confided myself to nobody. Every one supposed that the death of my wife and children was the cause of my sadness. I reached London. I obtained, with unspeakable emotion, some intelligence of the person whom I was seeking; but the traces of her existence were almost entirely erased, and the little I heard, did not conduce to my consolation. From all that I heard, I concluded she had gone to America. I hastened thither in pursuit of her, but without success. I spent several years in fruitless endeavors to trace her out; when I returned to my house, more dejected than ever. The manifold journeys, and dangers which I had undergone, the uneasiness which never left me—all these broke down my constitution, and I sank gradually into the helpless state, in which you now see me. My health is irrecoverably lost; my riches are odious to me; all my hopes are fixed upon death, which will release me from my sufferings, and restore me to the arms of my wife and children."

This is the history of that miserable man, whom the neglect of a single humane action had rendered so unspeakably unhappy. None but a generous and noble man, could have accused himself so strongly, on account of such an omission, or have been exercised by so long a repentance. After the lapse of several years of such grief and sorrow, his sister died, whose presence and care had alleviated his sufferings. This new misfortune hastened his death. He felt the approach of it with indescribable joy, thanking God that he was at last to be released from his miserable situation. For his sufferings had separated him long ago from the world, and he longed for heaven, and the rest of the grave.

Thus the dark and narrow grave may become dearer to man, than the most brilliant palace. So little can the possession of external goods make us happy, if it is not connected with the possession of that highest treasure, peace, and contentment of mind, and the testimony of a good conscience.

NORTHEASTERN NEW-YORK.

Mr. Todd, of Pittsfield, Massachusetts, has given in the Observer, some further account of this unexplored region and the Long Lake settlers:

The grandeur and the number of mountains in this wilderness, is almost incredible; while the lakes defy any attempts at description. Of these there are more than *two hundred*, whose names I know, and with whose location I became acquainted, counting none whose diameter is under about two miles, while some of them are fifteen, and eighteen, and twenty miles the longest way. Most of these lakes are embosomed among mountains, which seem to hang round them like rough but stern guardians. The highest of these, Blue Mountain lake, (or, as I believe, now called Lake Emmons, in honor of that distinguished geologist,) is over eighteen hundred feet higher than Lake Champlain. It would take a man in vigorous health, using all the strength and diligence which he could possibly command, to visit all these lakes so as to obtain any tolerably correct notions of them, at least six months. My friend, the Rev. Mr. Allen, and myself, visited only *twelve* of them in four weeks of wilderness life, aided by a most intelligent guide, enduring a fatigue that was great indeed. The scenery on these lakes is grand, and beautiful beyond anything of which I ever conceived. The lakes of Scotland have been celebrated of old, in story and in song; but the time will come, I doubt not, when these lakes will become the most interesting resort to be found in this country, for the great, the rich, the curious, and the fashionable. Most of them are surrounded by forests which grow down to the water's edge, and glass themselves in mirrors, which reflect every leaf: most are studded with romantic islands, covered with the mighty forest, where the eagle finds a home unmolested, unless, peradventure, the hunter causes the smoke of his camp to curl up among the trees, and scare him from his eyrie. The shores are a mixture of bold, iron-bound, and bays of sandy beach, like those of the Upper Saranac, Tupper's lake, and Long lake, or they are rectangular, unique, majestic, and indescribable, like those of the Racket lake. Of all the sheets of water upon which my eyes ever rested,—and I say this after having passed through Lake George four times, and among the "thousand islands" of the St. Lawrence twice, under the most favorable circumstances,—none will compare with Racket lake, for sublime and mysterious beauty. Two hunters have selected this spot as their permanent home, where they have built the hunter's lodge of bark, and adorned it with the antlers of many an old stag, and many a trophy of the art and skill of man over the instincts of the forest; and if they have an eye to the grand or the beautiful, I did not wonder at their choice. Suppose you follow the Racket river up south from Long lake, now on its waters, and now carrying your boat and baggage for miles through the forest, wearied, and ready to sink down under the fatigue, yet at once you revive and forget it all, when you look forward for miles through what would seem to be an opening made by square and compass, through the forest, while through that opening you see the lake spreading out into space unknown at the time, with fairy-looking islands, that seem to float on the surface of these glorious waters. But Racket lake is not alone in its power to create deep emotions in the soul.

Suppose you are out on the Big Tupper's lake in your little boat, so frail and light, that your guide can carry it on his head for miles through the wilderness. You look up the lake, and see islands extending for miles in length, and then in the long distance, say ten miles off, you see the white pathway of the Bog river, as he comes out of his dark solitude, and tumbles headlong down the everlasting rocks, leaping into the lake, and lost forever. Then your tiny boat floats under an island, whose perpendicular height of solid rock must be hundreds of feet, and which seems falling on you, while you know that the dark waters beneath your boat are at least eighty feet more! Or suppose you come up (south) Lake Champlain, and propose to enter this wilderness as the Indians used to do, by following one branch of the Au Sable, and going through "the Indian pass." Your journey is wilder and wilder, till you reach the magnificent gorge through which the Au Sable pours its mountain waters, and where the *perpendicular rocks are one thousand feet high!* Under these everlasting battlements you may stand and look upward in silent amazement; or you may go to the top, and creep out, and look off, shuddering and shivering, and feeling that you have hitherto known what *emotion* meant only by name!

Besides these spots which now occur to me, the hunters will tell you of some vastly more marvelous, but which, not having seen, I dare not describe. On the Blue Mountain lake, however, you will find a great curiosity in the islands, whose foundation is white limestone or marble. Many of these rocks present beautiful arches, as regular and true as if chiseled out by man, and large enough to receive your boat, and conceal it from the eye without. These arches are formed by the action of the waters. The philosophy of its wearing in this particular shape I did not learn.

From the New-York Tribune.

IRELAND AND THE STATE TRIALS.

Dublin—Its Beauty—Not Prosperous—St. Patrick's Cathedral—Meeting at Conciliation Hall—O'Brien—Maurice O'Connell—Daniel O'Connell—Aspect of Repeal—Words to American Repealers.

DUBLIN, January 22, 1844.

Dear Sirs—Ill health has prevented my attending the State Trials, or seeing much of this renowned city. I have observed enough, however, to prove to me that Dublin is a very elegant, but not prosperous place. The shipping is confined almost to coal vessels, and quays which should be musical with the hum of commerce, are deserted. Dublin is by far the handsomest city I have as yet visited in the Old World. Many of the houses are superb—the streets are long and spacious, and the public buildings are truly magnificent. The Irish patriot, Brennan, accompanied me in a walk to most of the architectural lions—such as the Castle—the University—the Courts, and the St. Patrick's Cathedral, which formerly belonged to the Catholics, but is now in the possession of the Protestants. This cathedral is a structure, which, before the hand of spoliation defaced its altars and reformed (!) its embellishments, must have been superb. The banners of the Order of St. Patrick still wave from the walls, and the ancient helmets of the knights ornament the aisles. This old cathedral is in the Deanery immortalized by the eccentric Swift, of whom many *local* anecdotes are still related by the people of Dublin. In the building there is a very fine bust of Curran. Much opposition was made by the Chapter to its erection in a Protestant "meeting-house"—but Genius prevailed, and the immortal orator's features are preserved in one of the stateliest piles of his beloved city.

It would delight you to see the mirthfulness of the Irish amid all their desolation—especially after leaving the solemn, drowsy faces of the English. If soul, as some philosophers contend, consists in fire—the Irish people got in some manner or other, a more than fair proportion—for they are undoubtedly the most fervid and enthusiastic people in the world. As to their hospitality—that is earth-renowned. Why here, the gentleman from whom I have taken rooms, treats me already more like a son than a lodger.

I attended the meeting in the Conciliation Hall last Monday. The room, which is very large, was crowded to excess—a great many ladies being present, and beautiful many of them were. The distinguished Smith O'Brien, a descendant of Brian Boroihme, was called to the chair amid enthusiastic cheers. The Hon. M. P. is a large, well formed and intellectual looking man, and filled his post with much dignity. Maurice O'Connell, a son of the liberator, was present, and supplied the place of his brother, John O'Connell. Maurice addressed the repealers in a happy and manly manner. O'Neil, M. P. next arose—but had scarcely opened his speech, when the whole audience commenced swaying to and fro like a convulsed ocean—and well it might—for the liberator—the patriot, the glorious O'Connell, was entering the hall. I cannot—no one can—describe the thrilling cheers, and the sublime enthusiasm of the audience. He had just left the court for a moment, to see his co-repealers, and this circumstance no doubt heightened the ardor of the people. Mr. O'Connell, notwithstanding his age, and trying services, looks hearty—indeed he may live twenty years yet, to watch over Ireland and annoy her enemies. His face is the expression of good humor itself—his manner in speaking was quiet and fatherlike, but sublimely impressive. So firmly and delightfully did he rivet my attention that I thought, when he closed his remarks, that he had not been speaking more than six minutes—but a recurrence to the watch proved that the liberator was on his feet more than twenty-five. His remarks were of a most pacific nature, entreating the people to remember his advice. Some one has truly compared O'Connell's oratory to an imperceptible torrent. The old patriot retired amid the same demonstrations of applause which welcomed his appearance. O'Neil then resumed his remarks. This gentleman is a very pleasing speaker—rather more polished than forcible. He may be called a beautiful declaimer, (in the best sense of the word,) as contradistinguished from an orator. He seemed very popular with the repealers. I left Maurice O'Connell handing in moneys to the treasury.

The repeal movement is one of peace, and the determination visible on the brow of every one, speaks volumes. You hear no intemperate expressions—every one seems to attend to his business—and quiet reigns over the whole city. The movement of the government in excluding Catholics from the panel is telling with tremendous effect. One thing I hold to be certain—repeal must triumph. Never were a people more determined than this people. I say this, well knowing the meaning and the effect of such words. Indeed the American repealers should not be idle. The repeal treasury is subject to enormous drafts, and the friends of freedom over the water should do all in their power to aid Ireland in the present legal crisis—a bleeding land calls for assistance.

Yours truly, W. W.

A ROMANCE OF REAL LIFE.

The Bristol, R. I. Phœnix has the following extract from a letter, written by a gentleman on board the United States ship Fairfield, to his father, a resident of Newport, R. I. The letter was dated at sea, September 25th, 1843:

"While we were at Athens, as I was one day rambling about among the ruins of some of the temples, among other places I wandered into a cemetery, and after looking around some time, admiring the construction of some of the tombs, and the beautiful flower beds, I was surprised to meet the man who had the care of the place, and being addressed by him in good English, we soon became acquainted. He belonged to Bristol, R. I. which place he left 20 years ago, during which time he had been fighting for the Greeks, against the merciless Turks, and had seen the former gain their independence. For eighteen years hard fighting he had received nothing—the country being much involved by its protracted wars. His name is George Wilson. He took me to his cottage in the cemetery, the only dwelling there for living. His cottage was neat but humble. He introduced me to his wife and four children. His wife is a Grecian woman, beautiful to look at, and seemed very kind. She speaks tolerable good English. He has a daughter about 15 years old, and three boys younger. His whole desire seemed to be to get his family to the United States. He has two sons in Bristol, by his first wife, who, he says was Abby Waldron, and that it was her death that first caused him to come on board the ship, and on the Sunday following he came on board with two of his boys. The officers noticed him, and on hearing his story, were willing to assist him to get his family to the United States. The captain shipped his two boys, who will be taken care of. The ship's company raised by subscription over one hundred dollars, and the officers raised up a handsome sum for him, ample to pay his expenses to America, and before this, I think he and his family are on their way to the United States, where the boys will meet them."

Mr. Wilson's two sons are still living in this town, and will no doubt rejoice to again meet their father, whom they supposed had long since departed this life. He is well remembered by many of our citizens.

SERIOUS JOKE.

The Pittsburgh Chronicle has heard of a wedding, which some days since took place at Lawrenceville, near that city, which was intended as a joke, but which has been declared binding, as the parties were lawfully "joined together" by an alderman, who, also, in addition to his other duties, preached occasionally. The parties are respectable and wealthy, and are every way worthy of each other. It was the result of a banter on the part of the lady, which was promptly complied with on the part of the young man, by his offering to go immediately and have the ceremony performed.

They went to the alderman, communicated to him their business, and in "less than no time," he went through the marriage ceremony, and declared them "man and wife." But when the functionary requested them to kneel down with him for prayer, the parties hesitated, and inquired of him, whether he had really, lawfully married them. To this he replied in the affirmative and they left his office much alarmed at what they had done, and which they intended for a joke. Whether they have agreed to live together, we have not learned. It has been the occasion, however, of some considerable "town talk," for the last few days.

From the New-York Tribune.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

The (Warsaw) Western New-Yorker, says:—"Divine law sanctions, and the welfare of society calls for, the existence of *Capital* Punishment. *Supposing even the welfare of society did not call for it, what right has man to question the expediency of the matter as long as the law of God is imperative?"*

Mr. New-Yorker! will you answer us a few plain questions? viz:

1. Who made *you*, or any one who agrees with you, an authoritative interpreter of the law of God for *us* who understand it differently? You say that the declaration, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," is a *command* to all men, to shed the manslayer's blood. We cannot so understand it, any more than the passage, "The wicked shall not live out half their days," is a command to us to kill them; or "Whoso taketh the sword shall perish by the sword," is a command to us to kill every soldier. Now when a man comes to us saying, "God commands men to put murderers to death," we answer, "We cannot so understand the record, but if *you* do, it is a law to you—do *you*, then, fulfill it"—and this is taken as an *insult*. It really seems hard, that any should find fault with us for not obeying in *their* sense a law which we interpret very differently, and yet consider themselves insulted when we request *them* to execute it in their own way.

2. If the interpretation put on a disputed passage of the Bible by a portion of the clergy—no matter if backed by a majority of the people—is to be enforced as an imperative law of God, no matter what is the "*expediency*" of the case, or whether the welfare of society does, or does not call for it, in what practical sense is it true that we have no established religion in this country, and that all sects are equal in the eye of the law?

When you have answered these, we may ask some more.

FOR HOUSEKEEPERS AND FARMERS.

Asparagus Beds.—Dress your asparagus beds with a compost of well-rotted manure and ashes; then sprinkle salt freely over them.

If you desire to form new beds, the sooner the beds are formed, the better, and the plants set out.

Peas.—If it is your wish to have an early crop of peas, you should sow as soon as you can get the ground ready. The pea is a hardy vegetable, and will stand both frost and cold. We have grown them amidst snow. The best way to raise the early crop, is to gather up broad furrows, split them in half, and sow plentifully of seed. The ground in which peas most delight, is a deep sand, or sandy mould, in good condition, and but moderately manured. The rows should be four feet apart. If it be desirable to secure a continuous supply of peas for table or market, they should be sown at intervals of a week, for five or six weeks in succession.

Cabbage Plants.—If you have provided yourself with a bed of cabbage plants, and they are big enough, the sooner they are transplanted, the better; therefore, as soon as the ground can be dug, prepare your bed, by manuring heavily, digging deeply, and raking firmly, and set out your plants. If you want to preserve them from the cut-worm, make a mixture of soot and sulphur, brought to the consistency of cream, by hot water; and as each plant is set out, dip the roots and stem in the mixture, as far up as the bottom leaves.

Early Turneps.—Prepare a bed thus: dress it well with long manure, dig it in deeply; then rake the bed well, after which, sow on about an inch deep a compost of well-rotted manure and ashes, six parts of the former to two of the latter; then rake this in, sow your turnep seed, rake it in, and press the seed with the back of a spade; and when the plants first begin to show their heads, sprinkle a mixture of *ashes, sulphur, and soot*, over them early of a morning, four or five days in succession; or if you prefer it, you may sprinkle fish oil over them with a mop.

Early Potatoes.—These should be planted as soon as you can get your ground ready—manure the bed well before *digging* it up—and be sure to put *plenty* of long manure in the drills, so as to cover the potatoe sets well; and then, before covering them up, sprinkle them over with lime or plaster.

Fruit Trees of all kinds, Shrubbery, Grape Vine Cuttings, &c.—Everything of this kind should be planted out as soon as the ground can be got in readiness.

Gooseberries, Currant and Raspberry Bushes, should be trimmed, dug around, or transplanted, as early as possible this month. If you have none of either, get some of each, and plant them out, for no garden should be without such excellent fruit.

Strawberries.—If you have a bed of strawberries, clean and dress it without delay. If you have not, procure the plants, and set a bed out, as no father should permit his family to be without such a delightful as well as healthful luxury.—*American Farmer.*

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

(Second Edition.)

JUST Published, and for sale at this office, a new work on Capital Punishment. By Charles Spear. It contains a variety of thrilling and instructive anecdotes; also, all the capital offenses in every State in the Union; and a speech from O'Connell on the subject. Also, several instances of the execution of the *innocent*. Facts are drawn from history and observation, and the entire scripture ground has been examined. The work is embellished with a fine engraving. Price, 62 1-2 cents.

TEXAS AND MEXICO.

JUST published, and for sale at 143 Nassau street, fourth part of "The Legion of Liberty:" being a remonstrance of some of the Free Men, States, and Presses, to the Texan Rebellion, against the laws of Nature and of Nations. Price 6 cts. single; 50 cts. per dozen.

TEACHER WANTED.

AT Trenton, N. J. on the 1st of April, a colored school teacher, well qualified to teach Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Grammar, Geography, Rhetoric, Mensuration, and Book-keeping. None but a well-qualified person need apply. The teacher must not be engaged in any other business, but able to devote his whole time and attention to the school.

The school consists of thirty or forty scholars, at two dollars per quarter each; and the State appropriates from $100 to $160; making about $250 salary.

JOHN ANNOLL,
(51 Warren street, near Trenton Bank.)
ROBERT THOMAS,
CHARLES JAMES,
February 29, 1844. ISAAC WELSH.

TEXAN REVOLUTION.

Republished (with additions) at Washington, D. C., from the Northampton (Mass.) Gazette.

To which is added,—

A LETTER FROM WASHINGTON, ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, AND THE LATE OUTRAGE IN CALIFORNIA—REPUBLISHED, WITH ADDITIONS, FROM THE LIBERATOR. By Probus.

This is a pamphlet of about 100 large octavo pages. Only a small part consists of the republications; the additions being ten or twelve times larger than the originals. The subjects discussed, are:—

I. The history and merits of the Texan Revolution, under the following heads:

1. The perfidy of the President, and the lawless proceedings of citizens of the United States, who went to Texas "to sow a rebellion."

2. Kindness, hospitality, and generosity of the Mexicans; ingratitude and treachery of the revolutionists.

3. Pretexts of the Revolution. Under this head is a very full account of the political changes which have taken place in Mexico, and of their causes;—the working of the Federative or Federal form of Government, as compared with the Consolidated or Central, in the South American States; a comparative history of *Nullification* in Mexico and the United States; the difference between the South American Federal and Central systems substantially that between our present form of government, and the form proposed by ALEXANDER HAMILTON; the political history of the South American States, and the history and prospects of nullification in the United States, some test of the comparative value of the two systems.

4. Real Causes of the Texan Revolution.

II. The subject of the second Part, or Letter, is the design of annexing Texas to this Union, *at the first session of the next Congress.* The subdivisions of this subject are:—

1. Review of a letter (said to have been, originally, private,) of ex-Governor Gilmer, of Virginia, on the necessity of the speedy annexation of Texas.

2. The principles, speeches, reports, official correspondence, and operations of the leading and confidential friends of John Tyler, in the Cabinet, and in Congress; the alliance between them and the leading members of the democratic party for the extension and perpetuation of slavery and the slave trade, by the acquisition of Texas and California; the outrage committed by Commodore Jones in the latter province, a part, and in execution, of the secret schemes of the cabinet, and a natural result of their spirit and purposes; the ostensible reasons for that outrage examined.

3. The determination and tendency of their policy to bring about a war between the United States of the one part, and Mexico and Great Britain of the other; it being perfectly understood that the former cannot be despoiled of territory fifteen times as large as the State of New-York, and eighty times as large as Massachusetts, without war with Great Britain, as well as with her

4. The Oregon Bill, a part of the said schemes.

5. The questions of *Visitation* and *Search, on the coast of Africa, for the arrest of slave trading pirates*; the actual extent of the slave trade, and its exclusive prosecution under the American flag; the Quintuple and Ashburton Treaties, Gen. Cass's pamphlet and correspondence in France.

6. Negotiations of our government with Mexico for the cession of Texas and California, from the accession of Gen. Jackson to the present time; Character and proceedings of Messrs. Poinsett and Butler, ministers of the United States, in Mexico; suppression, and probable destruction of official documents; *corruption* brought to light; correspondence of Messrs. Webster and Thompson, with Messrs. de Bocanegra and Almonte; *mistranslations,* in our Department of State, and in our Legation at Mexico, of Mexican official documents.

APPENDIX.

1. John Quincy Adams's opinion of the conduct of our government towards Mexico, extracted from his address to his constituents, September 12, 1842.

2. Collection of Proclamations of neutrality, issued by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Van Buren, and Tyler.

☞ For Sale at this Office.

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

Upright men shall be astonished at this, and the innocent shall stir up himself against the hypocrite.—*Job. xvii. 8.*

Abhor detraction, the sin of fallen angels, and the worst of fallen men.—*Wm. Penn.*

NARRATIVE of the Proceedings of the Monthly Meeting of New-York, and their Subsequent Confirmation by the Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, in the case of Isaac T. Hopper. Just published, and for sale at this office, No. 143 Nassau street, New-York; and at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 31 North Fifth street, Philadel.

FREE CALICOES!

JUST received, 1 case fine calicoes. Also, 2 cases fine shirting muslins; together with a large assortment of other free dry goods, at reduced prices, wholesale and retail. CHARLES WISE,
Northwest corner Arch and Fifth streets.
Philadelphia, 8th, mo. 17th 1843. tf.

PHILADELPHIA ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE.

No. 31, North Fifth street.

The National Anti-Slavery Standard, will be issued regularly from this office, on Thursday of every week.

TERMS—the same as in New-York; i. e. $2,00 a year if paid in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months.

$10,00 in advance will pay for six copies for one year, sent to one address; and $30,00 will pay for twenty copies.

A full assortment of anti-slavery publications is kept constantly on hand. Also, a handsome variety of miscellaneous books, and useful and fancy stationery.

All letters relating to the business of the office should be directed to *J. Miller McKim*, No. 31 North Fifth st.

LOCAL AGENTS FOR THE STANDARD.

EDWARD M. DAVIS, Philadelphia, Penn.
J. MILLER M'KIM, " "
AMARANCY PAINE, Providence, R. I.
LORRIN WHITING, New Marlborough, Mass.
LUTHER MYRICK, Cazenovia, N. Y.
W. C. BLOSS, Rochester, N. Y.
JAMES COOPER, Williamson, Wayne Co., N. Y.
PLINY SEXTON, Palmyra, " "
J. C. HATHAWAY, Farmington, Ontario Co., N. Y.
WM. T. CRITTENDEN, Rushville, " "
WM. P. POWELL, No. 61 Cherry st., New-York City
THOMAS McCLINTOCK, Waterloo, N. Y.
MORRIS EARLE, Penn Yan, Yates Co., N. Y.
R. D. H. YEEKLEY, Rushville, N. Y.
ROBERT H. FOLGER, Massillon, Ohio.
SETH WHITMORE, Dixon's Ferry, Lee Co., Il.
SLOCOMB HOWLAND, Sherwood Corners, Cayuga co. N. Y.
PRINCE JACKSON, Syracuse, Onondaga Co., N. Y.
THOS. HUTCHINSON, King's Ferry, Cayuga Co. N. Y
CALEB B. ROGERS, Norwich, Conn.
H. W. WILLIAMS, 25 Cornhill, Boston, Mass.
J. C. MERRITT, Bethpage, L. I.
JESSE HOLMES, Lloydsville, Belmont Co., Ohio.
JOSEPH A. DUGDALE, Cortsville, Clark Co., Ohio.
JAMES BOYLE, Cincinnati, Ohio.
ASAPH TURNER, Geneva, Ashtabula Co. Ohio.
JAMES AUSTIN, Marlborough, Stark Co. "
ISAAC LEWIS, Short Creek, Harrison Co., Ohio.
DR. ABRAHAM BROOKE, Oakland, Clinton Co., Ohio.
WILLIAM CRAFT, St. Clairsville, Ohio.
Capt. ALEXANDER H. ROBINSON, Nantucket, Mass.
DOCTOR IDDINGS, Greensboro, Henry county, Ia.
R. E. GITLET, Oberlin, Lorain Co. Ohio.
DAVID WOOD, Mt. Gilead, Marion county, Ohio